The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Volume XXXII July 1958 Number Three

CONTENTS

Editorial 170

Dirk Philips' Life 171
William Keeney

Two Letters by Pilgram Marpeck 192
Torsten Bergsten

Pilgram Marpeck in Recent Research 211
William Klassen

Attendance in Mennonite Colleges 1956-57 229
Silas Hertzler

Bibliographical and Research Notes 234

Leo Tolstoy and the Mennonite Author Daniel Musser
Melvin Gingerich

Nikolaus Gerbel's Purported History of Anabaptism
Heinhold Fast

Correction
Robert Friedmann

Bibliography of Works in the English Language Dealing with the Hutterite Communities
Robert Friedmann

Book Reviews 239

Hans Georg Fischer, *Jakob Huter, Leben, Frömmigkeit, Briefe*
Reviewed by Robert Friedmann

Joseph Lecler, *Historie de la Tolerance au Siecle de la Reforme*
Reviewed by John H. Yoder

Leonhard von Muralt and Walter Schmid (Editors), *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz. Erster Band*
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender

Elmer Lewis Smith, *The Amish People*
Reviewed by J. Winfield Fretz

Gerhard Fast and Others, *In den Steppen Sibiriens*
Reviewed by Cornelius Krahn

EDITORIAL

SINCE NO ADEQUATE ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF DIRK PHILIPS HAS ever been published in English, the REVIEW is fortunate to be able to publish in this and the following issue two articles by William Keeney, based on a dissertation on Philips at Hartford Theological Seminary, the first devoted to Philips' life, and the second to his writings. The author has distilled out of the original Dutch sources every possible bit of information about Dirk's life and career, and has set forth the resulting material with complete factual accuracy and full documentation. This will be the standard English treatment, exhaustive and reliable. Still more important will be the theological essay to follow.

THE FIGURE OF PILGRAM MARPECK LOOMS UP WITH INCREASING SIGNIFICANCE for the Anabaptist movement as the thorough study of previously known though not fully exploited and the newly discovered sources proceeds. Seldom has so much devoted scholarship been applied to one Anabaptist figure at one time as has been the case with Marpeck in the past three years. Three capable doctoral candidates have been at work directly on Marpeck, J. J. Kiwiet of Holland, William Klassen of the United States, and Torsten Bergsten of Sweden, and a fourth who shared in the discovery of striking new sources, Heinold Fast of Germany. We hasten to bring a comprehensive report on this recent research by William Klassen. We are most fortunate also to have the privilege of presenting in full original German text and parallel English translation the two most important of the sixteen Marpeck letters in the *Kunstbuch*, both hitherto unknown, the German edition by Bergsten, and the English translation by Klassen. Klassen's evaluative and critical summary report not only gives the latest achievements in Marpeck research but also points out some of the divergences in interpretation between Klassen-Bergsten and Kiwiet. In this debate the weight of evidence seems to fall on the Kl.-B. side. The issues reach deep into the understanding not only of the role of Marpeck and his theological position but also of the understanding of the whole of South German and Swiss Anabaptism. The last word has probably not yet been said. If Marpeck's brotherhood, as Klassen calls it, was really a distinct Anabaptist group sharply separated from the Swiss Brethren, why is there not more evidence of their existence in Bossert's *Täuferakten* of Württemberg. The answer may be either that the group was small, much smaller than the Swiss Brethren who were also located in exactly the same territory in South Germany as well as in Switzerland, or that the Marpeck group was so slightly different from the main body of Swiss Brethren that it was not distinguishable from them in the minds of the public or at least of the court officials. We are most grateful to these four young scholars, each from a different country, three of them owing much to Professor Blanke in Zurich under whom they studied, for their major contributions on the "Menno Simons of the South," the most copious and perhaps the most theological of all the 16th century Anabaptist writers.

ONCE AGAIN THE REVIEW PRESENTS SILAS HERTZLER'S CAREFUL STATISTICAL report of attendance at American Mennonite schools and colleges. This year again shows an increase in attendance and degrees granted.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

DIRK PHILIPS' LIFE

WILLIAM KEENEY*

BACKGROUND AND TRAINING

Dirk Philips was born in Leeuwarden, probably in 1504.[1] It is generally believed that Dirk's father was a priest there, and it is from him that the name Philips (meaning the son of Philip) comes. The major sources for the opinion that Obbe and Dirk were sons of priests are those who were unfriendly to the Anabaptists. There is no mention of it in early Anabaptist writings. Hullu reports that the copy of Jan van Batenburg's Confession, dated February 7, 1538, found in

*William Keeney is Instructor in Bible at Bluffton College. He holds a B.D. degree from Mennonite Biblical Seminary and has done graduate work at Hartford Theological Seminary.

1 The date of 1504 is accepted by all the sources consulted even though they give no support for the date for the most part. Frederik Pijper, in volume X of *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, p. 5, refers to Steven Blaupot ten Cate, *Gerschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Friesland* (Leeuwarden, 1839) p. 57. Ten Cate in turn refers to a note of Gerard Maatschoen in his translation of Hermannus Schijn, *Uitvoeriger verhandeling . . . van de Geschiedenis der Mennoniten* II (Amsterdam, 1744) 387, n. 4. Maatschoen gives no support for his date.

There are a variety of spellings for the name Dirk Philips. His own spelling seems to have been Dirck Philips, as it appears in his letters (*BRN* X, 691-93). It also appears abbreviated as Dirck Phil. (*ibid.*, 689) and Dirck Phl. (*ibid.*, 690). It appears as Dierick P. in another instance, however (*ibid.*, 688). Obbe uses a variety of forms in his "Confession." It appears as Dierrick Philips (BRN VII, 130, 135); and as Dierrick Philipsz and Dierrick (*ibid.*, 136); and again as Dirrick P. (*ibid.*, 118). In the same volume it appears elsewhere by fairly contemporary writers in a variety of forms. It appears as Dirick Philipssoon (*ibid.*, 45, 47, 50); Dirck Philipssoon (*ibid.*, 50, 55, 56); D. Philips (*ibid.*, 449, 450); Dierick P. (*ibid.*, 438); Dirck Philipsz (*ibid.*, 520, 522). In other than Dirk's own usage it appears as Derrick Philijps in *BRN* X (p. 586); and Pijper uses the form Dirk Philipsz. Other authors use it as follows: (1) Dutch authors: "Dirk Fillips"—Karel Vos, *Menno Simons, 1496-1561* (Leiden, 1914); J. G. de Hoop Scheffer, in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1884, 1-24; "Dirk Philipsz"—A. F. Mellink, *De Wederdopers in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 1531-1544* (Groningen, 1953); "Dirk Philips"—W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de Zestiende Eeuw* (Haarlem, 1932); N. van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnhem, 1952); S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Friesland* (Leeuwarden, 1834); (2) German authors: "Dirk Philips"—Cornelius Krahn, *Menno Simons 1496-1561* (Karlsruhe, 1936); Anna Brons, *Ursprung, Entwickelung und Schicksale der altevangelischen Taufgesinnten oder Mennoniten* (Norden, 1891); (3) American authors: "Derck Philips"—H. E. Dosker, *The Dutch Anabaptists* (Philadelphia, 1921); "Dirck Philips"—John Horsch, *The Mennonites in Europe* (Scottdale, 1942); "Dirk Philips"—C. Henry Smith, *The Story of the Mennonites* (Berne, 1941). In French it was apparently Theodore Philippe (see *BRN* X, 52, note 2).

the archives of the Mennonite Church in Amsterdam,[2] has a note after Obbe's name indicating that he was the son of a priest born in West Friesland, and identifies Dirk Philips as his brother.[3] Ubbo Emmius, a Frisian historian of the Reformed persuasion who published a work in 1616, says that Obbe and Dirk were "born of a concubine by a priest of Leeuwarden."[4] J. H. Ottius in 1672 also reports the brothers as sons of a priest of Leeuwarden.[5] A statement of Guy de Brez in his book *Wortel, Oorspronck en Fondament der Wederdoopers* is interpreted by Steven Blaupot ten Cate to suggest that Philip might have been a sexton rather than a priest and that popular reports may have led to the confusion that identified him as a priest. Nevertheless he showed in the same discussion that it would not have been an uncommon occurrence if they had been sons of a priest.[6] The marriage of priests had apparently received a quasi-legal status during that period. More recent writers have not followed ten Cate's suggestion, but generally accept Emmius and Ottius as correct.[7]

That Obbe was Dirk's brother has been unquestionably accepted. Gerardus Maatschoen was apparently in error when he reported that there was another brother, Lucas, who was also a Mennonite minister.[8] The year of Obbe's birth is unknown, but de Hoop Scheffer believes that Dirk was the younger since his name was always cited second.[9] This is the only knowledge that has remained concerning Dirk's family background.

Little is known concerning Dirk's early years. A letter of Joachim Kükenbiter (Nossiophagus) to "Herrn Gerdt" (Gerhard Herbordingk) indicates that Dirk was "out of the Franciscan rabble."[10] This letter does not definitely establish that he was actually in orders, but on the basis of this report it is generally accepted that Dirk was connected with the Franciscans in some way before his break with the Roman Church. The surmise is made by de Hoop Scheffer that Dirk left the cloister that had been moved outside the

2 J. de Hullu, *Bescheiden betreffende de Hervorming in Overijssel* I (Deventer, 1899) 246; see *Inventaris der Archiefstukken . . . te Amsterdam I* (Amsterdam, 1883) 28, No. 189.

3 *Ibid.*, 252.

4 ". . . sacerdote Leovardiani ex concubina nati" in Ubbo Emmius, *Rerum Frisicarum Historiae Decas Sexta* (Emden, 1616) 258.

5 *"Ubbo & Theodoricum Philippi, fratres, sacerdotis Leovardiani filii,"* J. H. Ottius, *Annales Anabaptistici* (Basel, 1672) 84.

6 Steven Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Groningen, Overijssel, en Oost-Friesland* (Leeuwarden, 1842) 250 f. Guy de Brez's book was first published in French under the title *La Racine, Source et fondement des Anabaptistes . . .* in 1656. It was translated into the Dutch and published for the first time in 1570 (*ME* I, 428).

7 Cf. J. G. de Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der Kerkhervorming in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1873) 17, and *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1884, p. 1; Vos, *Menno Simons*, 327; *BRN* X, 5.

8 Schijn-Maatschoen, *op. cit.*, 387, n. 4. This suggestion was at first accepted by Blaupot ten Cate (*Geschiedenis . . . Friesland*, 57), but later refuted when he discovered that the dates made this relationship impossible (*Geschiedenis . . . Groningen*, I, 251).

9 De Hoop Scheffer in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1884, p. 1.

10 "Aus der Franciscaner hauffen," reprinted in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. VI (1884) p. 502 with accompanying comments by Albrecht Ritschl under the title "Wiedertäufer und Franziskaner," 499 ff.

city of Leeuwarden in 1498 and was relocated in a building around the "Galileeer-Kerk" in that city.[11]

Dirk seems to have been well educated, so that some believe that he was preparing for the priesthood, although this would not have been too likely if he were the son of a priest. Cassander, a Catholic, although very tolerant for the age, [12] is one of the primary sources for this view of Dirk. He says,

> After the death of this Menno, Dirk Philips, a brother of Obbe, undertook (his) task with no less zeal and with an equal popular eloquence, but with greater learning and knowledge of letters, which some books written by him of late years declare. So it is to be regretted that such genius equipped with so many gifts served to confirm heresy and schism, rather than using them to renew the true church; although the sect of this latter one would be better than others and corrected some of their absurd errors.[13]

Schijn echoes this opinion of Cassander from a more partisan point of view.[14] From this some have supposed that Dirk may have attended a university, but there seems to be no positive evidence for this other than the inference from the fact that he did reflect some acquaintance with classical languages and sources.[15] Ubbo Emmius supports the view that Dirk knew the classical languages. He stated that Dirk Philips was "a man of more than ordinary gifts in Latin and Greek."[16]

One finds evidence of this knowledge of languages in Dirk's writings. In the *Enchiridion* he inserts a parenthetic explanation of "the Word" as *Logos* in Greek and *Sermo* or *Verbum* in Latin.[17] In another place he quotes I Timothy 1:5, giving a paraphrase in the Dutch and quoting the Latin: *a quibus, nempe a charitate, corde puro, dona conscientia et fide non simulata.*[18] He also quotes from Isaiah 30:15 (mistakenly cited as Isaiah 18) from the Latin: *In silentio et spe erit fortitudo vestra.*[19] In the same writing he quotes a proverb: *Obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit;* and a little further

11 See de Hoop Scheffer, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1884, p. 2.

12 See *Mennonite Encyclopedia* I (Scottdale, 1953), p. 522.

13 "Cuius Mennonis iam vita defuncti partes suscepit Theodoricus Philippi Ubbonis illius frater, zelo non minore, pari eloquentia populari, eruditione vero et literarum cognitione maiore, quod libelli aliquot ab eo his annis proximis editi declarant. vt dolendum sit tantum ingenium, tot dotib. instructum, haeresi potius & schismati confirmando, quam verae Ecclesie instaurande seruire, quamuis caeteris huius secta melior sit, & absurdos nonnullos suorum errores corrigat." Georg Cassander, *Opera ovae reperiri potuerunt omnia* (Paris, 1616).

14 Hermannus Schijn, *Historiae Mennonitarum Plenior Deductio* (Amsterdam, 1729) 185 f.

15 Cf. *BRN* X, 6 f.; *ME* II, 65a. Vos seems to be alone in his opinion that Philips' learning is not as great as supposed and is largely dependent on Schijn's uncritical acceptance of Casander's opinion. (See *Menno Simons*, 327 f.)

16 "Theodoricus Philippi . . . vir Latine et Graece non vulgariter doctus." Emmius, *op. cit.*, 325. See *BRN* X, 7, n. 2.

17 *BRN* X, 138; Philip, Dietrich, *Enchiridion oder Handboecxken*, English translation by Abram Kolb, *Enchiridion or Handbook* (Elkhart, 1910); 97.

18 See *BRN* X, 558.

19 See *BRN* X, 593.

on, *Et amara est veritas inquit Hieronimus, et qui predicant eam, replentur amaritudine.*[20] He also quotes Horace in *Arte Poetica* as saying: *Grammatici certant, et adhuc sub iudice lis est.*[21] And finally, he quotes from Zechariah 11:17, *O Pastor et Idul', . . .* which follows after the Vulgate, *O pastor et idolum, derelinquens gregem: . . .*[22]

One finds two words from the Greek used. His reference to *Logos* has already been indicated. One notes the use of *Paracletus.*[23] Three expressions from Hebrew can also be noted. Two were in the same paragraph: *Schadae and Sebaoth.*[24] The other was a reference that *tetragrammaton* was used for the name of God.[25] These instances taken singly would not necessarily indicate much training. Combined with the indications of writers who were inclined to be antagonistic, his probable association with the Franciscans, and the writings which are extant, these uses tend to confirm a better education than the average. This can be accepted despite his own assertion that he was a man of "small gifts."[26]

In addition to the classical languages, it is not too surprising to find that he came to know German, since he probably lived in northern Germany most of the time after 1537. His later writings particularly contain a number of Germanisms.[27] Some have speculated that he may have made a trip to South Germany or France, during which he wrote one of his last tracts in French, since the only known copies are translated from the French.[28] To this has been added the opinion that because of the court testimony at Utrecht in 1562, his father was perhaps located in the southern Netherlands (Brabant) at the time of Dirk's birth and was later moved to Leeuwarden. At this trial one of the Anabaptists, Beatris, stated that Dirk spoke "Brabants."[29] If this were true, he may have had some knowledge of French, since it was quite common in that area. It is more likely, however, that the writing referred to above was written in either Dutch or German and translated into French, the original being lost. An accent which had crept into his speech because of the long residence in Germany may have given Beatris the impression that he spoke Brabants. Beatris was not a very well educated woman and may have had only a limited knowledge of such dialects.

20 See *BRN* X, 606.
21 See *BRN* X, 607 f.
22 See *BRN* X, 611.
23 See *BRN* X, 63; *Handbook,* p. 13.
24 *BRN* X, 60; *Handbook,* 9.
25 *BRN* X, 160; *Handbook,* 122.
26 *BRN* X, 182; *Handbook,* 146.
27 For examples, see *BRN* X, 93, 95, 108, 112, 113, 141, 276, 385. See *BRN* X, 517-34 to note the increase of Germanisms in a later writing.
28 See *BRN* X, 657 ff.; *Handbook,* 519 ff.
29 Samuel Cramer, "De Doopsgezinde gemeente te Utrecht van 1560 te 1562, uit onuitgegeven bescheiden." *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen,* 1903, p. 21.

Furthermore, he refers to Friesland as "our fatherland" in the *Sendtbrief . . . aen de vier St.* (Letter . . . to the Four Cities).[30]

RELATION TO MÜNSTERITES

Dirk Philips was baptized by Peter Houtsagher, one of the apostles commissioned by Jan Matthys.[31] This occurred at Leeuwarden between December 25, 1533, and January 2, 1534. Little is known concerning his other activities during this period aside from that which is reported by Obbe Philips in his Confession. Obbe asserts that Dirk was the only one who would help him when he attempted to oppose the revolutionary tendencies of the Anabaptists. Obbe twice takes pains to dissociate both Dirk and himself from this type of activity.[32] On the contrary, the anonymous author of *Successio Anabaptistica* says concerning Obbe's brother Dirk, ". . . we do not know much, for he was one of the revolutionaries who marched on the Oldeklooster."[33] Nicolai also identifies Obbe as being united with Jan van Batenberg in revolutionary activity in the province of Groningen.[34] These latter two were scarcely reliable, since they desired to discredit the Anabaptists, and would seize upon such information as most damaging.

The only defense from Dirk's extant writings is to be found indirectly. He continually opposed those who formed the revolutionary or fanatical sects. In his writing *Van de Geestelijcke Restitution* (Concerning Spiritual Restitution) in answer to the writings of Bernhard Rothmann, who defended the Münsterite kingdom under a similar title, he says,

> What they cannot defend with the New Testament, they try to defend with the Old Testament and with the letter of the Prophets. And out of this many sects have come, many false religions have been established; yea, out of this fountain principally have flowed the idolatrous ceremonies and display of the church of Antichrist and the deplorable errors of the revolutionary sects which in our time have, under the guise of the holy Gospel, of faith, and of the Christian religion, done much damage and wreaked much mischief.[35]

Other men, such as J. H. Ottius, who was not particularly favorably inclined toward the Mennonites, insist upon a common origin with the Münsterites.[36] Nevertheless he seems to have separated Obbe and Dirk in some respects from the revolutionaries.[37] There is also

30 See *BRN* X, 519; also 527.
31 Mellink, *op. cit.*, 35.
32 *BRN* VII, 135.
33 ". . . vveten vvy oock niet veel eeren, want hy is een gheweest vande oproermakers, die nae Oude closter trecken." *BRN* VII, 61; see also 46.
34 *BRN* VII, 361 f.
35 *BRN* X, 342; *Handbook*, 323.
36 Ottius, *op. cit.*, 142.
37 *Ibid.*, 84.

ten Cate's report of Nikolaas Blesdijk's statement that Obbe and Dirk along with Menno were unable to check the revolutionary element as long as the kingdom of Münster stood.[38] The above-mentioned letter of Kükenbiter also says, "They recognize the government to some extent and are not revolutionaries."[39] It would appear that his common origin with the Münsterites is undeniable, but it seems unlikely that he participated in the revolutionary activities.

Dirk must have left this area soon after the fall of Münster, for it seems certain that he was engaged in the debate with Kükenbiter in Hamburg in 1537.[40] This incident indicates the prominence to which he had already risen within the movement. No definite location can be fixed for Dirk's activities during the next decade. The traces that are found indicate that he was active in the area of Germany from Emden east. There is considerable difficulty in reconstructing this period because of circumstances arising from their being sought by the authorities. Letters, for example, seldom contained the names of persons involved, for they might prove to be incriminating evidence to the authorities. Menno Simons often used abbreviated forms; it is suggested that he may have used a code to identify himself.[41] This was also an aggravating issue in the dispute later in Dirk's life. He defends the necessity for using initials to designate the various parties despite the potential threat that this would have been if the authorities gained possession of the key.[42] There is also the additional possibility that the Anabaptists may have sought anonymity by the use of aliases. This is suggested by Kükenbiter when he says, "They not only change their clothing, but also their names for fear of being discovered."[43] Vos also states that Obbe changed his name to Aelbrecht after his defection.[44]

Jan van Batenburg's Confession places Dirk third upon his list of Anabaptist leaders in 1538.[45] He places David Joris at the head of the list, Obbe Philips second, followed by "Dirck syn broeder." It must be remembered that Jan van Batenburg was probably willing to implicate the peaceful Anabaptists to the fullest extent possible.

38 S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland* I, 93, quoting N. Blesdijk, *Historia Davidis Georgii* (Daventriae, 1642) 6: "quibus (scil. Ubboni et Theodorico Philippi) tandem accessit Menno Simonis . . . sed hi suis hisce de Monasteriensium negocio querelis adeo nihil effecerunt quamdiu Monasteriensium res essent salvae, vt multorum in se odia concitarent et pro Regni Christi hostibus haberentur a plerisque. See also *BRN* X, 11, n. 2.

39 *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* VI, 502.

40 The letter has been dated by Ritschl as written in 1539. The debates with Dirk were placed by Kükenbiter as two years prior to the writing of the letter, thus 1537. *Ibid.*, 499-502.

41 See Menno, *Complete Works*, 1060; and the note of the translator, 1064.

42 *BRN* X, 606, 607.

43 *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* VI, 502; ". . . sie vmb vormerckens wyllen nicht allein ir kleydinge sunder auch yre namhen vorandertten, . . ."

44 Vos, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1917, p. 136.

45 Hullu, *op. cit.*, 252.

His factual material may be used with some confidence, but any implications that they were associated with him or the revolutionaries must be subjected to validation from other sources.[46]

ORGANIZATION AND PURIFICATION OF THE MOVEMENT

Vos believes that Dirk Philips participated with Menno in the ordination of two additional elders, Gillis van Aken and Adam Pastor, about 1542.[47] This date is confirmed by Ottius who lists the following under the year 1542: "Menno and Dirk Philips sent other preachers and bishops from time to time, among whom was Adam Pastor, of Westphalia."[48] This may have been an attempt to reorganize and bolster the leadership after the defection of Obbe, which apparently occurred around 1540. It had also become increasingly evident that David Joris was not in accord with their position.

The next rather definite trace of the activity of Dirk Philips was as a participant in the dispute with Nikolaas Meyndertsz van Blesdijk, a follower of David Joris.[49] Nikolaas was at first a follower of Menno but became convinced of David Joris' special revelation. This led to a dispute which Christian Neff places at Lübeck in 1546.[50] Cornelius Krahn also accepts this date.[51] The other participants in the dispute were Menno Simons, Gillis van Aken, and Adam Pastor.[52] The central issue of the debate seemed to be whether or not a certain form of baptism or church organization was necessary. This arose from the contention of David Joris that in order to escape persecution one could feign conformity to a Roman, Lutheran, or Reformed Church while holding contrary views. This was predicated upon the belief that external forms were of little consequence. David Joris had already removed his residence to Basel, where he lived under an assumed name and had a cloak of respectability within the Reformed Church of that city. Dirk did not seem to play as large a role in this debate as the other participants.

It may have been this dispute which revealed certain differences between the majority of the leaders and Adam Pastor. In any event, a series of debates were held with him concerning the problem of Christology. The first took place in Emden in 1547 where Menno and

46 Cf. Mellink, *op. cit.*, 393.

47 Vos, *Menno Simons*, 95, 102. Cf. *BRN* VII, 50, which gives the general period as 1542-47.

48 "Menno & Theod. Philippi alios iterum concionatores & Episcopos miserunt, inter quos Adamus Pastor, Westfalus, al. Bohemis." Ottius, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

49 For a sketch of Nikolaas and his major writings, see *ME* I, 360-61, article by Christian Neff.

50 *Ibid.*, 360b.

51 Krahn, *op. cit.*, 65, especially n. 211. Cramer accepts an earlier date, 1545 (*BRN* V, 319); also Pijper (*BRN* X, 14 f.).

52 Krahn also includes Leenaert Bouwens, but no support could be found for this. It is doubtful that he was present since he was not an elder before 1551. See Krahn, *op. cit.*, 65.

Dirk attempted to "blow out the spark," according to the *Successio Anabaptistica.*[53] It seems that Menno and Dirk were the major opponents of Adam Pastor and Frans Kuiper. The issues dealt with were the Incarnation of Christ, the rejection of infant baptism, and the place of avoidance in marriage.[54] No agreement was reached, but the participants agreed not to preach openly on these issues. It was probably at this time that a further discussion was arranged, which took place at "Goch in t'landt van Cleef" in 1547.[55]

By the time of the assembly at Goch, where it appears that not only the elders but others also were present, Adam Pastor had developed his point of view to the extent that he denied the divinity of Christ as well as the trinitarian view as a whole.[56] This time the major disputants seem to have been Adam Pastor and Dirk Philips. It seems quite certain that Dirk Philips was the one to pronounce the ban upon Adam Pastor and thereby to formalize the split that was already evident.[57] Some have believed that Menno was not in agreement with Dirk in this action and later, in 1550, expressed his regret of it in a statement in his "Confession of the Triune God." He says in a parenthetical remark, "May the Lord not count it as sin against those who have broached these matters."[58] Those who have been critical of Dirk because of his later attitude and use of the ban have tended to read back into this situation the beginning of a split between Menno and Dirk on the issue. Menno's assertion of his unity with Dirk after this, and their statement of accord on the ban seem to indicate that though Dirk was the spokesman, Menno at least gave implicit consent to the action.[59] One also needs to take into account that Adam Pastor placed the responsibility upon Menno and not Dirk for this outcome of the dispute.[60]

Krahn has given an excellent delineation of the basic differences

53 *BRN* VII, 50. The following is primarily dependent on his account of the meeting.

54 ". . . de Menschwerding Christi, verworp de kynderdoop, stont toe de Echtmyding, en derghelycke dwalingen." *BRN* VII, 50.

55 *BRN* VII, 50.

56 *BRN* VII, 50, refers to "Adam met syn anhang" and p. 464 confirms this further by stating: "Als sy nu aldaer hymelick ghecomen waren, so hebben sy beyde in de teghenwoordicheydt van hare Aenhangers oft Discipulen, seer herdt, wijt ende breet daer van getwist ende ghedisputeert."

57 *BRN* VII, 51.

58 *Complete Works,* 489. The edition of 1681 gives it as "de Heere en reken het haer voor geen sonde, die't op de Banne gevoert hebben." (*Opera Omnia,* fol. 385.) The English is not as ambiguous as the original which leaves open the question as to whether Menno was speaking of those who let the ban come into use, or of those who by their contrary opinions had brought about divisions which led to the ban. The former construction is defended by such men as Kühler, *op. cit.,* 287 ff., and Vos, *Menno Simons,* 104 ff. Krahn defends the latter construction, *op. cit.,* 69 f. This could perhaps also be a use of a formula adopted by Menno from II Tim. 4:16. It sounds reminiscent of this phrasing, and was a practice not at all uncommon to Menno and Dirk. If so, this would tend to support Krahn's contention.

59 See *Complete Works,* 761, for a statement of unity in 1554, as well as a defense that "Adam Pastor has left us is not our fault."

60 See *BRN* V, 522; also 322.

between Menno and Adam Pastor.[61] This could apply as well to Dirk. The position of Pastor is to be found in his only extant writing, "The Difference between the Correct Doctrine and the False Doctrine."[62] Adam Pastor continued to preach and to secure a following. He prepared the way for the coming of Socinianism in this area toward the end of the sixteenth century. There is no doubt that he was a brilliant and sincere man, as is attested by the judgment of men who, though sympathetic to the Anabaptist view, disagreed with Pastor's antitrinitarian position. Krahn says concerning him, "Adam Pastor, to judge by his writings and the testimonies about him, must have been Menno's equal throughout in Biblical knowledge, in general knowledge and ability."[63] Dosker is even more extravagant in his estimate: "He was unquestionably the most brilliant man and scholar in the entire Dutch Anabaptist community of his days."[64] It is likely that his extremely logical mind and his rational tendencies forced him to his antitrinitarian position when he was unable to fashion a completely reasonable explanation of the Incarnation. Dirk Philips wrote a poem or hymn of twenty-two stanzas to counteract the confusion resulting from Pastor's teachings.[65] There are indications of a meeting in Emden in 1547 in which seven ministers seem to have taken part. The discussion centered on the use of the ban and the matter of marrying outside the faith *(buitentrouw)*. Dirk mentions it in the preface to his last writing, *Van die Echt der Christenen* (Concerning Christian Matrimony) which was printed in 1569. He places the discussion as "more than twenty years ago."[66] A letter of Menno Simons reported by Nicolai also mentions a meeting in which Menno had spoken with the oldest Brothers, and he guesses it was about 1547.[67] Whether or not this was at the time of the dispute with Adam Pastor is not indicated.

Sometime between 1547 and 1553 Menno Simons and Dirk Philips ordained Leenaert Bouwens as an elder, according to the report in *Successio Anabaptistica*.[68] The date given by ten Cate is 1551.[69] This is also accepted by Wenger,[70] but the support for ten Cate and Wenger's dating is not evident. Kühler and Pijper accept

61 Krahn, *op. cit.*, 71.
62 "Underscheit tusschen Rechte Leer unde Valschen Leer," reprinted in *BRN* V, 315-581.
63 Krahn, *op. cit.*, 70.
64 Dosker, *op. cit.*, 58.
65 *BRN* X, 693 ff.
66 "meer dan ouer twintich Iaren," *BRN* X, 626.
67 ". . . ick meyne An. 47. met den outsten gesproken," *BRN* VII, 448. See also *Complete Works*, 1050.
68 *BRN* VII, 51. Menno wrote a letter to Bouwens' wife in 1553 to encourage her since she seemed to fear the danger for her husband as an elder. This would indicate that the ordination was prior to that date.
69 Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis . . . Friesland*, 60; *Geschiedenis . . . Holland*, 21.
70 *Complete Works*, 1038 n.

1553 as the date of Leenaert Bouwens' ordination but also fail to cite any supporting evidence.[71] They may assume that the letter from Menno to Leenaert's wife was written very close to the time of ordination.

In 1554 Dirk participated in another important conference.[72] This meeting was held at Wismar where Menno was living at the time. Menno mentions it in a letter to Emden in 1556.[73] There were seven leaders present at this meeting, including Menno Simons, Dirk Philips, Leenaert Bouwens, and Gillis van Aken. The question of the ban was the principal subject under discussion. Other topics included the matter of marriage outside the church, the bearing of arms, the use of courts, and the problems related to the activities of unauthorized itinerant preachers. The nine articles drawn up at this conference have been preserved in more than one place, but the discrepancies in the various texts make the exact decisions uncertain.[74]

Whether or not it was at this meeting or a later one is not certain, but in the same year, 1554, a "secret meeting" was held at Mecklenburg. Dirk Philips as well as Menno and other "leading elders" was present at this meeting. It appears that Gillis van Aken had been guilty of adultery and the elders met to deal with the situation. When Gillis repented and promised to reform, they decided not to ban him.[75]

THE BEGINNING OF DIVISIONS

As the development of the movement has been traced, a certain pattern has been emerging. In the period around 1530 to 1540, there was an individual struggle to find release from the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. This was found by placing the authority in the independent study of the Scriptures. Individuals found fellowship as they shared their common discovery and expressed their interest in re-establishing the church. Gradually differences as to how this was to be accomplished developed and more definite groups began to emerge. Some thought the re-establishment was to be in the form of an external, political kingdom based on the Old Testament theocracy. Another major group interpreted this on an entirely spiritual basis and attempted to erect a spiritual church which was primarily inner and individual. A third group attempted to re-establish the

71 Kühler, *op. cit.*, 279; *BRN* X, 23.

72 *BRN* VII, 51-54; 448.

73 *Complete Works*, 1050.

74 Cf. *BRN* VII, 52-54, see esp. n. 1, p. 52. For an English version, see *Complete Works*, 1041-42; a note is given regarding the corrupt texts, p. 1042, n. 1.

75 See *BRN* VII, 59-60, 233, and 438, for very similar reports of the incident.

church as a fellowship of believers who gathered together to actualize the Christian life of discipleship in ethical and moral living.[76]

The divisions became increasingly apparent between 1540 and 1555 as the differences among the groups were more clearly defined. This process took place primarily among the leaders of the various groups. Only gradually did a group consciousness within and among congregations develop. The conference at Wismar, in which the nine articles were formulated and definite standards were published, signaled the arrival of a new era for the group following Menno and Dirk. This was no longer the era of individual opinions set against other opinions. More formal statements of positions had been published which now could become rallying points for congregations and groups to distinguish themselves from other groups.

This seems also to have reflected to a degree two trends which became accentuated in the next fifteen-year period, 1555-70. As a movement develops, it loses some of its original fervor and dynamic. Group cohesiveness can be maintained while the movement is young because of the challenge to struggle with new ideas and to establish new forms, the challenge of the opposition, and the need to exist together or be destroyed. As the movement develops, the ardor cools and the organization no longer feels the threat of external pressures to the same degree.

With this changing situation both externally and internally the constructive task of working out the broader implications of the new position becomes more evident, and basic weaknesses in structure which were obscured in the earlier struggle for existence appear. In this particular situation the problem which became most evident was the perennial tension between freedom and order. The imposed hierarchical authority of the Roman Church had been destroyed in favor of a new freedom through the individual interpretation of the Scripture. The problem confronting the new group was the question of maintaining the orderly congregation that manifested in its life the kingdom of God to the degree that it could be perfected in imperfect men upon earth.

The closing days of Dirk Philips and Menno Simons' life were deeply involved in this struggle. One can easily imagine their disappointment and disillusionment as they saw the immense difficulties and the bitter divisions that occurred in the attempt to achieve proximate realizations of the great vision they had had of a new church reconstituted according to the New Testament ideal. Not only weak-

76 This follows substantially the delineation suggested in Franklin Hamlin Littell's book, *The Anabaptist View of the Church* (1952). See especially Chap. II, pp. 19-49. See also Robert Friedmann, "Conception of the Anabaptists," in *Church History* IX (1940) 341-65.

nesses in the structural organization but also individual weaknesses were accentuated in the process.

An incident which precipitated the first real manifestation of this divisive tendency occurred in 1555, just one year after the conference at Wismar, Leenaert Bouwens had banned a man in Emden for some unknown reason. He also insisted that the wife of the banned man, Swaen Rutgers, should avoid him, but she "would not shun her husband at the bed and table."[77] Though she was a pious woman otherwise, Leenaert Bouwens also pronounced the ban upon her.

Henrik Naeldeman and Joriaen Heyns of Franeker came to her defense. They had already protested against the stricter application of the ban and had received a letter from Menno Simons on the subject.[78] They were joined in their protest by Jacob Jan Scheedemaker of Emden.[79] Menno was called upon again and replied in a letter to the dissentious brothers at Emden on November 12, 1556.[80] He cited the decisions he and Dirk Philips had reached in 1547, and the articles drawn up at Wismar in 1554.

Menno was invited to a conference at Harlingen, probably in the early part of 1557.[81] He traveled by way of Dokkum, where a minister, Nette Lipkes, joined him, and to Leeuwarden, where Apollonia Ottes also joined him. They went on to Franeker for a conference with Naeldeman and Heyns. There seem to have been three major points of disagreement: (1) the question of shunning within the family and marriage relationship (*echtmijding*); (2) keeping sins confessed in confidence a secret; and (3) the requirement that in the case of heinous or criminal offense, the three admonitions of Matthew 18 be omitted and the ban instituted immediately.[82] Menno conceded the moderate point of view on the first and second items, but insisted upon the strict interpretation of the third. On this basis agreement was reached. It is reported that after the meeting Menno said, "If I also find them in the same way at Harlingen, I will jump for joy upon my crutch."[83]

Menno proceeded to Harlingen for the meeting which included Leenaert Bouwens and Dirk Philips. He had great hopes of arbitrating the differences and playing the role of a conciliator. Instead, he

77 "Deese vrou wilden haren man in t' bedde ende de tafel niet myden." *BRN* VII, 54.
78 *Complete Works,* 1043 ff.; *BRN* VII, 444-47.
79 *BRN* VII, 54 f.
80 *Complete Works,* 1050 f.
81 See Kühler, *op. cit.,* 318; *BRN* VII, 258. Kühler's discussion of the order of events is among the best, but his interpretation of some of the personalities seems somewhat severe.
82 Kühler, *op. cit.,* 319.
83 *BRN* VII, 258. Menno was a cripple apparently from an accident or illness about 1545-50. At least, after that date he signed his letters as "the cripple" occasionally. See *Complete Works,* 1045, 1051, 1056; see also 919.

discovered that Dirk had been convinced by Bouwens and that an entirely different spirit reigned there. He was overruled and the ban was pronounced against Naeldeman, Heyns, and Scheedemaker.[84] There is a report attributed by Alenson to Apollonia Ottes that Menno was intimidated by Bouwens with the threat of the ban and further division.[85] It seems that the point of contention at which they reached an impasse was the degree to which avoidance and shunning were to be practiced within the family relationships, the official decision favoring the more severe point of view.

The result of this episode was a division which brought the Waterlanders into existence. It also aroused questions on the part of the South Germans and Swiss as reports filtered through to them. They held noteworthy conferences in 1555 and 1557 at Strasbourg in which the question of the ban, the views concerning the Incarnation, and other such issues were discussed and acted upon.[86] It resulted in a delegation from the Rhineland, Zylis and Lemke, being sent to see Menno in April 1556. The meeting of over fifty bishops at Strasbourg resulted in more moderate views concerning the ban. Menno and Dirk both published works on excommunication in which they expressed stricter views than the South German conference had accepted. Menno's tract was entitled "Instruction on Excommunication," and appeared in 1558.[87] Dirk's is entitled *Lieffelijcke vermaninghe wt des Heeren Woordt* (Loving Admonition from the Word of God), which also appeared in 1558.[88] There was a further exchange of writings between Menno and Zylis. The result according to Kühler was that under the leadership of Leenaert Bouwens and Dirk Philips the Germans were banned and their baptism no longer recognized as a valid one.[89]

PRUSSIA AND UTRECHT

Economic depression, wars, and floods had resulted in considerable migration from the Netherlands along the familiar trade route via the Baltic to Prussia.[90] The religious persecutions of Charles V gave new and added stimulus to the movement. The Dutch settlement in Prussia started about 1527 and the immigrants were principally Sacramentalists until 1530. After that time they were almost

84 *BRN* VII, 55; 258 f.; 465 f.
85 *BRN* VII, 258 f. This report is of relatively late origin and is somewhat suspect. See Krahn, *op. cit.*, 92 f. for discussion.
86 See Blaupot ten Cate, *Groningen I, Appendix* III, 251 ff. for fuller accounts and conclusions reached at these conferences. Also Brons, *op. cit.*, 93-99.
87 *Complete Works*, 959-98.
88 *BRN* X, 249-65; *Handbook*, 223-41.
89 Kühler, *op. cit.*, 328.
90 William Keeney, "Dirk Philips. A study of His Life and Writings and of His Teaching Concerning the Church" (Thesis, Hartford Theological Foundation) p. 4.

entirely Anabaptists of both the Münsterite and peaceful varieties. It is reported that Jacob van Campen was planning to flee to this area when he was captured by the authorities in Amsterdam.[91] Vos reprints a statement from 1550 of a captured Anabaptist, Jan van Sol, that many Melchiorites fled to Danzig during the revolt in Amsterdam in 1535.[92] These refugees were not permitted to settle inside the city of Danzig but had to locate in the suburbs. Count Albrecht of Prussia was not particularly anxious to provide a haven for religious refugees but was primarily concerned with colonization, in order to assure the welfare of the country as well as his own income. It seems certain that he even used Jan van Sol, a former Münsterite, as an agent to recruit such colonists.[93] The Bishop of Lesslau, Cujavien, accepted them also in order to repopulate the land that had been ravaged by war in 1520.[94] H. G. Mannhardt lists others who came at the same time, from Moravia, Switzerland, and South Germany.[95]

Menno Simons had visited this area in the summer of 1549, as appears from a letter addressed to them on October 7, 1549. He says,

> To the elect, holy children of God in the land of Prussia, grace and peace. You know . . . what grievous solicitude, care, trouble, labor, and sorrow we experienced in your midst this past summer, as well as how it ended; a matter that still causes us to be greatly troubled at heart in your behalf, fearing lest the disturber of all peace and Christian love, that is, that ancient coiled serpent which never ceases his ragings, might by means of the past transaction once more sow his seed among many, and by means of all that follows, these might fall in God's sight and come to shame and our services of some weeks expended in your behalf be lost again; a thing which even though I write this, I nevertheless hope not.[96]

This gives evidence of discord and division which Menno apparently had settled, as well as confirming the tradition that he had worked along the Baltic Sea coast as far as Livonia.[97] His travels there seem to be the first occasion for the establishment of congregations in this area. Mannhardt is of the opinion that Dirk Philips and Hans Sikken may have accompanied Menno on this visitation. He further states that Menno probably made several visits to the area, and that Dirk only settled there permanently after Menno's death.[98] Kühler believes on the other hand that Dirk made his headquarters near Dan-

91 Mellink, *op. cit.*, 395.
92 Vos, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1917, p. 137.
93 H. G. Mannhardt, *Die Danziger Mennonitengemeinde* (Danzig, 1919) 39.
94 Much of the above discussion is dependent upon Bruno Schumacher, *Niederländische Ansiedlungen im Herzogtum Preussen zur Zeit Herzog Albrechts (1525-1563)*, Introd. & Part I, 1 (1902) 1-42.
95 Mannhardt, *op. cit.*, 25.
96 *Complete Works*, 1030.
97 Cf. Ottius, *op. cit.*, 84; Gottfried Arnold, *Unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historien* I (1740) 871.
98 Mannhardt, *op. cit.*, 42.

zig (probably at the suburb of Schottland) as early as 1550.[99] This early date does not seem too likely.

Although the date cannot be established with certainty, it seems that Dirk was too actively engaged in the conferences in the early fifties to be traveling so frequently from Danzig. It is also of interest to note that a period of productivity in writing occurs in the three years following 1555 when the conferences seem to have diminished.[100] This may represent the time for his removal to Danzig, although Mannhardt's dating is probably to be preferred to Kühler's.

It is certain that Dirk was active in Danzig in his last days. In *Het beginsel der scheuringen onder de Doopsgesinden* (The Beginning of the Divisions among the Doopsgezinden) the author states that Dirk Philips "had also come from Danzig to Emden."[101] Dirk indicates in his writing concerning the quarrel between the Flemish and Frisians that he had traveled from Prussia.[102] Old church records of Danzig also list Dirk Philips as follows:

> The year 1567 Dirk Philips had been an elder here at Danzig, who in the time of division in Friesland was sent there and died there in the following year, 1568.[103]

Court records also indicate that Dirk was as far south as Utrecht as late as 1561.[104] A small congregation had gathered there and was meeting in the basement of the house of a fairly well-to-do citizen, Cornelius van Voordt. In the latter part of December 1561 they held a special baptism and communion service. According to William Willemsz, a participant, about thirty or forty were present.[105] They gathered about four in the morning while it was still dark, remaining until about seven in the evening when it was again dark. In this manner they hoped to escape notice as they gathered and departed. The elder who conducted the baptismal and communion service was Dirk Philips.

It is in these court records that the report that he spoke Brabants is found, as mentioned above. They are also the source of the only firsthand description of his appearance. Beatris, an unlettered house-

99 Kühler, *op. cit.*, 310.

100 The October issue of the *MQR* will carry the installment, "The Writings of Dirk Philips."

101 "Vorders soo is ook *Dirck Philipsz* van Dantsick tot Embden gekomen." *BRN* VII, 542.

102 "om dat wy wt P[russia] ghereyst." *BRN* X, 550.

103 "A° 1567. Is heir te Dantzig oudsten gewest Dirk Philipsen die in den Scheuringstijt van Vriesland gesonden en aldaar het volgende Jaar 1568 overleden." In the *Danzig Mennonite Church Record*, starting with the year 1667. This is contained at the end of a list of ministers who have served the church. Original now in Bethel College Historical Library, North Newton, Kansas.

104 The following is taken from reprints of abstracts from "Verhooren van verschillende getuigen on andere stukken betreffende het process voor het Hof van Utrecht van den Procureur-generaal tegen Cornelius van Voordt en zijn huisvrouw wegens herdooperij, 1562." See Samuel Cramer, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1903, pp. 1-47.

105 *Ibid.*, 36

hold worker, reported that he "was clothed in black with an ordinary round hat and spoke Brabants."[106] Anna Heinrick Emkens described him as "an old man with a gray beard with white hair, a man of medium build."[107] It is probably appropriate here to point out that the best-known attempt to reproduce his appearance is the etching which appeared in Maatschoen's translation of an earlier book by Hermannus Schijn.[108]

Dirk apparently made a visit throughout the area at the time of his visit to Utrecht. Greta Grosheide reports the trial of Clara Jansd. van Ransdorp in Amsterdam. She had formerly lived at Edam and was baptized there by Dirk Philips about twelve or thirteen years prior to her trial (1575). This would place her baptism about 1562-63, thus probably a short time after Dirk's visit to Utrecht.[108a]

THE COVENANT OF THE FOUR CITIES

About 1560 four Mennonite congregations representing Franeker, Dokkum, Leeuwarden, and Harlingen in Friesland entered into a "Covenant" *(Verbond)* among themselves. It was made by the church councils and the ministers of the four congregations, and was kept a secret so that the exact details are not known. It consisted of nineteen articles which were agreements of co-operation among the four congregations. Kühler lists three areas of major agreement: (1) In event of a dispute that could not be settled within the congregation the other congregations would be called for assistance, and if it could not then be settled, outside ministers would be called for assistance. (2) The financial aid program should be carried on co-operatively and two deacons were appointed to supervise the program in all four cities. (This regulation seemed to be required owing to a large influx of refugees from the severe persecutions in Flanders.)[109] (3) The ministers should serve all four congregations and no congregation should choose its ministers separately. Ebbe Pieters was appointed to divide the preaching assignments in all four congregations and to handle the discipline problems.[110]

106 ". . . gecleet was int swarte met een gemeyn ronde mutse ende sprak brabants." *Ibid.*, 39.

107 ". . . een oudt man met een ghrijsen baert met wit haer, een matelyck man." *Ibid.*, 22, 42.

108 Schijn-Maatschoen, *op. cit.*, opposite 324. This etching has also been reproduced in such places as *ME* II, 16 of Illustrations, and John Horsch, *Mennonites in Europe* (Scottdale, 1942) following p. 140.

108a Greta Grosheide, *Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Anabaptisten in Amsterdam* (1938) 185.

109 Cf. A. L. E. Verheyden's article on "An Introduction to the History of the Mennonites in Flanders," *MQR* XXI (1947) pp. 51-63 for an account of these migrations based on the original court testimonies. Cf. also *BRN* VII, 534.

110 Kühler, *op. cit.*, 397-98. The following discussion is dependent largely upon Kühler; de Hoop Scheffer's article, "Het Verbond der Vier Steden" in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1893,

Two events in 1565 precipitated a quarrel which ultimately led to the division that marred the closing years of Dirk Philips' life, and was the real beginning of further divisions that ensued in the last half of the sixteenth century. Jeroen Tinnegieter, a refugee from Flanders, was chosen as a minister at Franeker. Under the Covenant Harlingen objected to his choice. A gathering of ministers including Dirk Philips was called at Harlingen to settle the matter. It was over this difference of opinions that knowledge of the Covenant leaked out. Dirk objected to the Covenant on the ground that it was a human addition to the Scriptures.[111] Others have interpreted his objections as resentment against those who proceeded with such action without his knowledge, and because he thought Leenaert Bouwens was gaining more authority with the group than he had.[112]

The other event occurred in Emden as Dirk was on his way back to Prussia. Leenaert Bouwens was in conflict with his congregation. The exact causes of the difficulty are not entirely clear, but it seems that Bouwens was prone to make too many trips to Friesland and the local congregation felt that he neglected them. He was also accused of being a drunkard. The more genial hospitality of the Flemish, who were different from the stolid and staid Frisians, seems to have been his particular temptation.[113] Personal antagonisms aroused by the severity of Bouwens' own position in such instances as the banning of Swaen Rutgers may have added fuel to the fire. Seven ministers including Hoyte Renix, Ebbe Pieters, and Dirk Philips sat in judgment upon the case.[114] The decision was to suspend Leenaert Bouwens as an elder, but not to ban him. It was probably out of fear of the latter that Bouwens accepted the suspension. He moved to a place near Harlingen and seems to have been well received, strangely enough, not by the hospitable Flemish, but the Frisians. Ebbe Pieters apparently dissented from the sentence at Emden, or at least refrained from making the decision. Hoyte

pp. 1-90; and Pijper's introductions in *BRN* X, 36-43, 512-16, 537-43, and 585-87; as well as Dirk Philips' writings in relation to the events, *BRN* X, 545-81; 517-29, and 589-613; and the accounts related in *BRN* VII, 62 ff.; 532 ff. The matter is very complex and the contemporary accounts are written from partisan points of view. The article by de Hoop Scheffer seems to be the best attempt to unravel the varying accounts and to give a balanced reconstruction of events.

111 See *BRN* X, 517-34; 545-81.

112 Kühler, *op. cit.*, 400 ff.; de Hoop Scheffer, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1893, 50 ff.

113 Since the difference in temperament is to have a significant influence in the coming disputes, it might be well to give a few more details concerning the contrasts between the Frisians and Flemish. The Frisians have been described as stiff, somewhat cool, and preferring to hide their feelings. They wore sober and simple clothing, paying little attention to the fashions. On the other hand they were elaborate and decorative in their linens and other household goods. The Flemish were boisterous and exuberant by nature, expressing their feelings quickly, easily upset but shifting rapidly from one mood to another. They cared little about their household goods or their food, but did like fancy and fashionable clothing. (Cf. *BRN* VII, 534 f.; Kühler, *op. cit.*, 406.)

114 *BRN* VII, 533.

Renix agreed, but later retracted his judgment and supported Bouwens, as appears in a letter of Dirk Philips.[115]

Jeroen Tinnegieter took the next step when, at a hastily called meeting, he with about thirty out of three hundred members of the congregation at Franeker rejected the Covenant of the four Cities. The majority tried in vain to have this decision reviewed and reversed. Ebbe Pieters finally came to the fore as the leader of the Frisians and the division began to harden along personal and cultural lines. Attempts were made to heal the breach. Hoyte Renix first tried to arbitrate but was suspected by the Flemish of having a predisposition in favor of the Frisians. The antagonisms were further heightened in May 1566, when Ebbe Pieters presented seven accusations against Jeroen Tinnegieter, from which mutual suspensions and recriminations proceeded. By August of 1566 there were mutual bannings of one another by the different groups.

Word reached Dirk Philips in Prussia concerning these events. On September 19, 1566, he addressed a *Sendtbrief . . . aen de vier St.* (Letter . . . to the Four Cities).[116] He added an appendix on the appointment of ministers, which had been drawn up after the suspension of Leenaert Bouwens in 1565 and indicates that Dirk Philips believed that Bouwens was involved behind the scenes in the dispute.[117] This letter reveals his great concern for the church and has a nostalgic note with regard to his "fatherland."[118] It was noted by de Hoop Scheffer that this was the time when the Reformed Church was rising into ascendancy in this area of the Netherlands and this fact may have added additional poignancy to the appeal for unity and peace.[119] Dirk offered his services if they could be of use in settling the dispute.[120] This letter contained two other signatures, V. B. and J. H., which have not been identified.

Dirk's appeal was unsuccessful. The groups did finally agree upon an arbitration committee, headed by two ministers from Hoorn in North Holland, Jan Willems and Lubbert Gerrits, who had been ordained as ministers by Dirk Philips.[121] They were to choose ten others to assist them in settling the dispute. Before entering upon their task, they required the parties involved to sign a commitment *(Compromis)* in which they agreed to accept the decision of the arbitration committee.[122] After hearings, they held a meeting at

115 *BRN* X, 602 ff.
116 *BRN* X, 517-34.
117 Cf. *BRN* X, 575 ff.; Dosker, *op. cit.*, 131.
118 Cf. *BRN* X, 519, 527.
119 de Hoop Scheffer, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1893, 82 ff.
120 *BRN* X, 522.
121 See *BRN* VII, 558; *BRN* X, 567 f.
122 Cf. *BRN* VII, 62 for reprint of the *Compromis*.

Harlingen on February 1, 1566, in which reconciliation was to occur. Both parties were required to kneel to confess their guilt and to ask forgiveness. The Frisians were permitted to rise. The Flemish, however, when they started to rise, were told that they must be lifted by the hands of the Frisians since they had the larger portion of guilt. One can well imagine the humiliation of the Flemish who felt they had been tricked, and that their volatile natures led to a sharp reaction. They were furious and denounced both the commitment and their confession of guilt. The situation was worse than before.[123]

The Frisians now felt constrained to call upon Dirk Philips for assistance as the last possible hope of a solution. Hoyte Renix directed the letter of invitation to him on behalf of the Frisians on April 17, 1567. The letter was very ingratiating and probably aroused Dirk's suspicions instead of currying his favor. Dirk, with a commission from his congregation and with two companions, Hans Sikken and Geert H., traveled to Emden to attempt a settlement of the dispute.[124] The endeavor was almost destined in advance to failure. It is likely that the Frisians knew of the unfavorable judgment which Dirk had already arrived at concerning both the Covenant and the commitment. He considered both as human institutions in opposition to the Scriptures.[125] In addition, he considered the two ministers from Hoorn, Jan Willems and Lubbert Gerrits, as too young to exercise the authority that they had been granted at the Harlingen meeting. He was also suspicious of their tolerance, for they had accepted into their congregation at Hoorn a man who had been banned by the Prussian congregation, without waiting for word from Prussia concerning him.[126]

Dirk and his companions traveled to Emden and sent a message requesting the involved parties to appear before him to present their cases. He received word from Willems and Gerrits that their congregations would not grant them permission to leave. Dirk responded with letters to Hoyte Renix, Lubbert Gerrits, and Jan Willems, and a letter to the congregation at Hoorn to be read in all the congregations in North Holland.[127] Dirk may have been trying to use Paul's technique in the case of Onesimus and Philemon. In any event, the intent of these letters was to suspend these men from their office until they had cleared themselves of guilt. Dirk felt that the only fair way to handle the situation was to have the accusations and defenses aired

123 See *BRN* VII, 540 f. for a description of the meeting.
124 See *BRN* X, 569, esp. n. 6. Nothing is known of Geert H. other than his last initial.
125 See his defense, *BRN* X, especially 557-64.
126 See *BRN* X, 553.
127 See *BRN* X, 689-90.

in the presence of the offended parties and before him and the other ministers.

The Frisians eventually sent a deputation of nine, four from North Holland and five from Friesland, to consult with Dirk Philips. They came to Emden and met with Dirk and the others, but Dirk was insistent upon his demand that Gerrits and Willems appear in the presence of the Flemish. He again suspended all the ministers from their offices. The ministers of North Holland met in the meantime and decided to send another delegation of four, including this time Willems, Gerrits, Renix, and Pieter Willems Bogart. These four met the other nine returning from Emden. After consulting, they decided that all thirteen should return to Emden. They reported to Dirk Philips, but Dirk was adamant and refused to see them. He would only see Gerrits and Willems in the presence of the Flemish, and they apparently refused to concede this point. Kühler believes that Dirk issued an ultimatum that was tantamount to banning the entire group, or at least was so interpreted by them, although Kühler is inclined to cast the worst possible interpretations upon Dirk's actions and motives throughout this controversy.[128] Whether in retaliation or in anticipation, the delegation from Friesland and North Holland met and on July 8, 1567, pronounced the ban upon Dirk Philips and four days later announced it to the Groningen congregation.[129]

As far as Dirk was concerned, this was the final attempt at reconciliation. The results were severely disappointing to him, for the conflict now resolved itself into two opposing and separate factions. If the interpretation of the event by Meihuizen is correct, it was an ironical alignment of groups and leadership. Leenaert Bouwens, who had encountered difficulties by his too free enjoyment of Flemish hospitality, was aligned with the Frisians. Dirk was aligned with the Flemish and banned by the Frisians. Meihuizen says, "The Flemish separated from the Frisians in 1570 because of the extreme authority of Dirk Philips among the Frisians."[130] Meihuizen can only mean the authority of Dirk's conception of the church and the ban, and not his personal authority. There is a measure of truth in this interpretation of the events, which now makes them appear ironical.

Dirk Philips had maintained what he felt to be a fair position in the controversy and had tried to uphold his high standards for the church according to what he felt the Scriptural requirements were.

128 See Kühler, *op cit.*, 425.

129 See *BRN* X, p. 586, for a partial reprint of this letter.

130 H. W. Meihuizen, "Spiritualistic Tendencies and Movements among the Dutch Mennonites of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." *MQR* XXVII (1953) 274.

There is a certain rigidity and a failure to project himself sympathetically into the position of others. The standard became more important than the man. The discipline of the church—banning, avoidance, and suspension from office—appears at times to be used not only to correct the offender in order to accomplish his redemption, but also as a penal measure to bring him into conformity to the standard. Menno Simons, although prone to vacillate on such matters, probably had a warmer feeling for other people, and attempted to save both the standard and the man.

It is not difficult to understand how this could develop and harden in a man like Dirk Philips. His life had been one of constant struggle to hold aloft and actualize a high vision of the Christian life and the church. He had broken with the Roman Catholic Church in which he may have attempted to find this perfection by joining the Franciscan order. When he saw the corruption of this institution and heard the preaching of the Hofmannites, he joined them. This resulted in successive struggles for purification: the break with the revolutionary Münsterites; the defection of his own brother Obbe; the struggle for ascendancy with the Jorists; the break with the antitrinitarian views of Adam Pastor. His great colleague, Menno Simons, had died in 1561. Leenaert Bouwens had apparently lost some of his zeal for purity of life. Now the Church was split with deep strife that seemed to be primarily based on cultural and personal differences, although the questions of the basic authority within the church and the calling and appointment of ministers were certainly knotty problems which had to be worked out existentially as well as theoretically.

Dirk spent his last days at Emden writing and publishing a defense of his actions as well as his version of the controversy between the Frisians and the Flemish. He felt his strength ebbing away and apparently looked toward release. In the preface to his last writing, *Van die Echt der Christenen* (Concerning Christian Matrimony), he says, "In addition, we are aged, weak and ill in the body and are looking to the Lord for our deliverance that we may enter into the blessed rest."[131] This treatise was finished on March 7, 1568.[132] Shortly thereafter, in 1568, he died near Emden at a place called het Faldern and was buried in Emden in the "Gasthuys Kerckhof."[133]

131 *BRN* X, 627; *Handbook*, 491. The "we" is an editorial usage.
132 *BRN* X, 649; *Handbook*, 518.
133 *BRN* VII, 462, 543 f. See also above in the church records of Danzig, p. 68. The date of 1570 given by de Hoop Scheffer, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 1893, p. 75, n. 5, for his death is in error. Maatschoen also chooses 1570 but recognizes the 1568 date as a possibility (Schijn-Maatschoen, *op. cit.*, 387, n. 4.).

TWO LETTERS BY PILGRAM MARPECK

TORSTEN BERGSTEN*

The two letters by the Anabaptist leader and theologian Pilgram Marpeck which here appear in print for the first time are taken from the *Kunstbuch*. This extremely valuable 16th-century Anabaptist manuscript was discovered in Bern in 1955, and its interesting discovery and contents are described and explained in the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 1956, p. 212-41, by one of the two discoverers, Dr. Heinold Fast.[1] Of the sixteen letters and tracts written by Marpeck contained in the manuscript these two have been selected because of their significant theological content. For the relation of several dogmatic concepts in the two tracts to the total theology of Marpeck the reader is referred to my work, "Pilgram Marpeck und seine Auseinandersetzung mit Caspar Schwenckfeld," which is currently appearing in the *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift* (Uppsala), 1957 and 1958.

The first letter is dated by Fast *ca.*1545. It is addressed to Anabaptists at Austerlitz, Moravia, with whom Marpeck had connections, and according to all appearances was written at Augsburg, where Marpeck lived from 1544 until his death in 1556. Marpeck himself dated the second letter at Augsburg, January 22, 1555, and the recipient is a certain Brother Abraham at Langnau near Strasburg. Marpeck lived in and near this city from 1528 until 1532. In Codex 464, Burgerbibliothek Bern, these two selections appear as No. 37, Fol. 302-306, and No. 15, Fol. 158-163, respectively, having been copied by the Anabaptist Jörg Maler. On Marpeck's life and thought, see also, J. J. Kiwiet, *Pilgram Marbeck (ca. 1495-1556). Ein Führer der Täuferbewegung der Reformationszeit* (Kassel: J. G. Oncken Verlag, 1957).

This publication of Marpeck's two tracts is in exact accord with the original text, with the following exceptions: The punctuation is modernized, and the words at the beginning of the sentences are generally capitalized, as also proper names, e.g., God, the Holy Spirit, Paul, Austerlitz. Abbreviations, as e.g., *br* for *Bruder, Brüder,* and *d'* for *der,* are clarified, and the text is divided into paragraphs. The lines printed in italics appear in red ink in the original. A few words which might be difficult to understand even for one who knows German are explained in the brackets.

I. ON THE INNER CHURCH[2]

This epistle reports on the inner churches, temple, dwelling place, revelation, inner choir, external work, the order, where and how one should worship, confess sin, etc., along with other matters.

* Torsten Bergsten, a native of Uppsala, Sweden, is pursuing doctoral studies at the University of Uppsala. He is devoting his dissertation to Balthasar Hubmaier, and with Gunnar Westin is at present preparing a critical edition of Hubmaier's works. His licentiate dissertation at the University of Uppsala (1955) was devoted to Marpeck and Schwenckfeld, and is appearing in print in a modified form (see above). This entire article, including the letters, was translated from the German by William Klassen, Instructor in New Testament, Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Elkhart, Indiana. The footnotes in the translation are supplied by the translator, who is completing a doctoral dissertation (Princeton Seminary) on the hermeneutics of Pilgram Marpeck.

1 The claim by Delbert Gratz that "this valuable document . . . is quite well known" (MQR XXXI [1957] 294), inferring that Fast and Goeters did not discover it, raises the question how to define a "discovery." Even if Fluri and Müller did know of it as Gratz claims, and even if a microfilm copy reposes in the Bluffton Library, should not the credit for its discovery go to the one who first recognized its worth and introduced it to the scholarly world?

2 In this translation an attempt is made to bring out Marpeck's meaning rather than to give a literally exact version, with the hope that the two are not mutually exclusive. The scholar will, of course, consult the original. As far as the present writer is aware, Marpeck has never before been published in English. The reference in George H. Williams, *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957) p. 288, is an error and refers to a work by Hubmaier.

To the elect, sanctified by God in Christ Jesus, our beloved in Austerlitz and other places, an answer, etc.

Grace and peace from God, our heavenly Father, through the Lord Jesus Christ, abide with you and all of us, who love Christ from the heart. Amen.

Dearly beloved, brethren and sisters in the Lord Jesus Christ. The messengers you sent to us have arrived through the grace of God. We received them and their report with sincere joy in Christ, along with your epistle to us in which we perceived your disposition, mind, and spirit, in Christ. Through the Lord's grace we understood everything and received it well with sincere joy. We also praise and thank our God and Father, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, for you and ourselves because of his mercy and grace which he has shown to us and all the children of men. For our mind desired sincerely to know how the faith of Jesus Christ, its knowledge and confession stands with you because eternal life consists in the knowledge of the truth of Christ alone. As also the Lord Jesus Christ, the true Son of God and of man, says, "This is life eternal that they know You, Father, true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent," because only in the knowledge of God the Father and His Christ human salvation and eternal life consists, is, and remains in eternity. What more joyous thing can we receive and experience from one another than when we are told, you about us and we about you, that we are of one mind in the truth of Christ and the Father and confess to one another that we know that Christ Jesus is in eternity unto eternity; indeed, that we also know and recognize and also feel that Christ is in us and we in Christ and remain so from eternity to eternity; also that we know and recognize that the dwelling of God the Father and His Christ, through Christ, is built in our hearts and now in this time They have made a dwelling, to dwell in us; yea, that we also know and recognize the fruit and work of the Son, which the Father works in the Son and the Son in us, that is perfect love, that we keep His word; thereby we recognize that the Father and the Son have made Their dwelling in us and live in us.

For these are they who love the Father and the Son and hold the words in unity. Those, however, who do not love Him do not keep His words. Yea, that we also recognize, that we love one another, as He loved us; thus we perceive that we are His true disciples. For whoever has this command and keeps it, he it is, who loves Him [God]; that one also will be loved of the Father, and Christ also will love him and reveal Himself to him. This is the true revelation of Christ Jesus that we feel and recognize that in us is done the will, work, and good pleasure of the Father through Christ, and thus God the Father dwells in Christ and Christ with God the Father in us and we in Christ with God. This place and dwelling was prepared for us only through Christ, and before Christ's ascension such a place and dwelling was prepared for no one, that we might have the cohabitation in us (God the Father and the Son), keep His word and His commands (which are not heavy but light).

Thus also we dwell in God, in God the Father and in Christ, in the Jerusalem which is above and not here beneath upon the earth. Therein is alone the place of worship, in which the true worshipers worship in spirit and in truth; in the fellowship of the saints, in such true and similar knowledge consists eternal life. This means to truly learn to know God the Father and Him whom He has sent (Christ), which is also life eternal if we receive such knowledge in Christ out of grace through prayer. Hence our joy toward one another is complete in God. Of this we rejoice in you,

as we hope that you also are rejoicing in us in the truth. For the Jerusalem which is above, which is built alone through Jesus Christ in the spirit, namely, the heart, is the inner and only temple. In this Jerusalem also is the place of worship, namely in spirit and in truth. That is also the inner choir and sanctuary (I mean the heart of men, i.e., the hearts of the true believers), into which no one can enter except alone our high priest; to Him alone the choir and sanctuary has been dedicated by God the Father, who is able to search the heart, thoughts, and soul. This choir and sanctuary is known only by the high priest Christ, for in it He prays to the Father for the sins of men. This high priest, Christ Jesus, alone sees and recognizes in the Holy Spirit how the inner choir and sanctuary is shepherded and formed. This church is seen alone in the spirit; in it alone, through the high priest Christ, is forgiveness and remission of sins. That is the inner church of Christ, in which eternal life consists, namely thus, that man now shall and must know for himself whether Christ dwells in him or not. Also God alone through Christ knows the status of the heart of man, whether right before God or not. This inner church will only be revealed through the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, when He will transfigure and reveal the hearts with Him. When however Christ, our life, is revealed, then we also will be revealed with Him in glory which he had before that time. It is revealed to no creature in heaven or upon earth, nay, not even to the angels, through no external work, even that which Christ already commanded and ordained to His church, because liars and hypocrites can also do this and in external appearance disguise themselves as angels of light.

This inner church in the Holy Spirit is also directed to perform external works (through the collaboration of the Holy Spirit) as a light before the world, as it witnesses inwardly between God and man that it is also formed externally and testifies in love toward the neighbor with teaching, baptism, Lord's Supper, and with all love to be shown toward all men according to the measure of the internal working of the Holy Spirit, unto the improvement of the external man in Christ; therein is also external forgiveness of sin. In this manner the spirit, mind, and will of the Father is revealed through the external man Jesus Christ bodily through word and work, in the same form as the internal working of God the Father. For no one comes to the Son, except the Father draw him, and no one knows the Father except the Son and to whom the Son reveals it. Hence today, as long as it is today, the full knowledge of the Father and of His Christ consists in the internal and the external workings of the Holy Spirit. Because also Saint Paul says, "In Him dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily," and ye are full of the same; one faith, one baptism, one teaching, one Lord's Supper, one God, Father of us all, over the one Church inner and outer in eternity.[3] Amen. For what the Son sees the Father doing (as Spirit and God), that likewise the Son does immediately as external man through outward working. For the Father loves the Son and has given all things into His hand; thus also what is born anew through Christ in the Holy Spirit according to the inner working of the Holy Spirit, is baptized with fire, kindled with love. And what such children born of the Spirit see the Father doing through Christ after the inner man, that they also do immediately through the cotestimony[4] in the Holy

3 These key verses (Eph. 4:4-6) in Marpeck's theology form an important basis for the writing of the *Verantwortung* (*Quellen und Forschungen* . . . edited by Johann Loserth [Vienna and Leipzig, 1929], p. 61).

4 "Mitzeügnus" is a technical term for Marpeck with various nuances. In this context it appears to be better translated as "cotestimony" than "co-witness."

Spirit on the external man. Thus also the body of Christ is built innerly through the Holy Spirit, externally through the testimony of works. That is His church or communion, which is His bride, internally in the spirit and truth, externally through the word of instruction to render obedience; joined together to praise God, as a light before the world, but separated from the world unto a witness over it, as also the Gospel through word and work must be preached before the coming of the Son of Man.

I do not write this that the place of Israel through the commissioned apostles may be accomplished or executed before the day of the Lord, but those will be completed and will have salvation proclaimed to them whom God the Father draws and gives to the Son. These He will keep and lose none of them, except the children of perdition. Even though the children who are kept will often, through the children of perdition, suffer great loss, though it may seem that they come to destruction and fall victims to it, yet not one of them will be cast aside. I mean those in whom hope remains through God, for hope is a spring from which one may receive again grace for the future as God pleases. Namely those who do not through lack of hope harden their hearts while it is called today may all be brought again in Christ through the assistance of His body which is today still upon the earth. That is the communion of the saints, in which through Jesus Christ is remission of sins. When the Holy Spirit punishes a sin which was committed, to Him alone it pertains first to punish before any external punishment of his saints. If however the Holy Spirit reveals this sin, the church of Christ then punishes through the cotestimony of the Holy Spirit; that is however the cotestimony of the Holy Spirit that He reveals sin. Thus also the saints cotestify that sins may not be tolerated on the body of Christ and separate them from the body of Christ. Those, however, which the Holy Spirit has punished innerly in secret through grace unto grace with the comfort of forgiveness, upon such no creature, either in heaven or upon earth, is authorized to inflict punishment, as some do out of false concern and judge the hearts and desire to reveal them before the time. As the Psalmist says, "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered, in whose spirit there is no guile." Whoever does not confess his sin before God, who knows and sees all things, him the Holy Spirit punishes with the revelation of the sin. If he then refuses to acknowledge or confess to God or to man, if the sin is openly known and seen on him, and he refuses through admonition and punishment, then he belongs to the world, whom the Holy Spirit will punish for the sin of unbelief. If however the Holy Spirit punishes unto grace, the hope that has been received remains with remorse for the sin, although it often takes a long time before this sin is forgiven by the Holy Spirit with inward comfort; which forgiveness and comfort naturally precedes all forgiveness and comfort in man as a spark of grace, through which divine fire (out of the fullness of Christ to give grace for grace) is further kindled with admonition and intercession of saints. So only when man confesses his sin before God and the fellowship of His saints in Christ against himself and judges himself does the prayer of the saints belong to such sinners. For all sin must be atoned with prayer through the death of Christ. If however there is no deceit in confessing sin and the prayer of the saints is pure, then only after that the Holy Spirit puts comfort into the heart of the sinner and forgives the sin. Only after that may the saints forgive him in Christ through the Holy Spirit, all of which

is only one forgiveness. For whoever grieves God has also grieved His saints, and whoever grieves His saints has also grieved God.

I write this to you therefore, my beloved, that we may in nothing, neither with ban nor forgiveness of sin, nor command or restriction, ordinance, nor usage outrun the Holy Spirit. As indeed there are many lawmakers and ban-ners today who capture the consciences and burn through the cheeks. Also there are many deceivers who completely despise and seek to discontinue admonition, prayer, ban, punishment, teaching, baptism, Lord's Supper, and the forgiveness of sins in the fellowship of the saints. Therefore, my beloved, let us in nothing allow the grace given to us to be taken away or robbed, but rather let us hold on to our unwavering hope in Christ, which I desire from the heart and ask for you along with us and all elect of God in Christ. Amen.

To write more and in greater detail (because the brethren from Strasbourg and brother Leopold[6] have written you in which they have also revealed my heart and mind with theirs), I consider unnecessary, because you will be informed by the brethren orally as the living epistle from us to you. I pray God, if it is or should be His pleasure and serve His honor, that He would allow us to read from mouth to mouth the letters written in our hearts by the finger of God, which I hope beyond doubt will take place. Pray God the Father through Christ that we all may fulfill and complete (the suffering of Christ which is left over in His body), each according to the manner of love unto and through death as faithful fellow-witnesses of the tribulation of Christ; that we also suffer one for another, as Christ has suffered for us unto the end. Amen.

Jörg Stadler and his matrimonial sister [wife] Anna, unknown to you by the face, send greetings, also my matrimonial sister [wife] Anna, and with me all those who are known to us and we to them according to the countenance; God knows all of our names. Pray God fervently and earnestly (according to the need) for us, which we shall also do as debtors for you and all who desire it and are obligated by love. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be and abide with us and all who love and seek Christ from the heart. Amen.

In the Lord Jesus Christ, your (and all true believers') servant and comrade in the tribulation of Christ,

P[ilgram] M[arpeck].

II. Concerning the Humanity of Christ

This epistle deals with the humanity of Christ and the Son of Man, etc., also with the Christian life and call, etc., and the difference between servant and child, etc.

Grace and peace from God, our heavenly Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, His beloved Son, be and abide with us and all who love and seek Christ of a pure heart. Amen.

Dearly beloved, loved in God the Father and in Christ. First we thank God for the bestowal of all His graces, which He, through Jesus Christ and for the sake of Christ, indeed, the Lord Jesus Christ himself working in us, does and accomplishes, ruling, directing, and leading us through His Holy Spirit in all truth of His divine will and good pleasure; namely, in all who love and seek Christ Jesus of a pure heart, in them He accomplishes the good pleasure of our heavenly Father. He, the Lord Jesus Christ, is alone the complete good pleasure of the Father. Therefore no

6 Most likely Leopold Scharnschlager.

one (indeed no creature, in heaven or on earth) is accounted as anything before the Father, but alone the Son of Man, who was born of Him of the virgin from the tribe of Judah and of the seed of David. This Son of Man (I say "son of man") is appointed a lord and ruler of all things; yea indeed humanity is taken up into God the Father and God the Father into the Son, who from eternity has been one essence, spirit and God; indeed, the true way, the truth and the life in true humanity by nature and kind, born of the generation of men in and of Mary, the pure virgin, a true, pure, immutable man. In him alone dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Out of the fullness of the Son of God all true believers are filled with the Holy Spirit, so that they may not speak anything unless Christ (the Son of God and of man) works, completes, himself acts and rules in them. This is written to the end that the deeds and omissions of all men (however lofty it may seem), however often the Lord is called a lord by men, yes, even recognized as the Son of God as even the devil has confessed and acknowledged Him, it still does not please the Father unless the Lord confess himself through his Holy Spirit in faith, through the physical mind of the believing man; and likewise no man can call the Son of Man "Lord" without the Holy Spirit. Even the unclean spirits can call Him a son of God indeed even a Lord. But to ascribe honor to the Son of Man as a true man of the race of men and to confess Him as their Lord and God, this no unclean spirit can do. Either they consider Him (the Lord) as purely human to whom they do not want to ascribe the honor that He is also Lord and God, etc., or else they confess Him as purely the Son of God also according to the flesh, thereby failing to ascribe to Him the honor of being a son of man, of the race of men, flesh, blood, and human.

The flesh is of a creaturely nature that is taken up into and entered into the Godhead and the Godhead is united and one essence in the flesh as the true Word which became flesh which is then the truth and the life itself. To the flesh, body, and blood I ascribe all the honors which the Father has ascribed to Him that I reasonably honor Him as much as the Father. Yes, I also grant Him all judgment which was committed to Him by the Father. For the very reason that He is the Son of man He will be a judge and not for the reason that He is also the Son of God, one essence in the Father. The spirit of the Father and of the Son are judges apart from and prior to that. The transfer [of power] which took place, took place for the sake of the humanity of Christ, that it might be honored like the Father as essentially true Son of God and of man. He, the man Jesus Christ (who alone accomplishes in the believers the good pleasure of the Father), He, the Lord, a true Son of man, is Lord, ruler, leader and director of His saints.

They know also through the Holy Spirit that all their commissions and omissions are governed and led in and through Christ, so that they do not live (understand unto the good pleasure of the Father) but Christ lives in them and accomplishes the good pleasure of the Father. Hence Saint Paul says that he dares speak nothing but what Christ works in him. Further, those whom the Spirit of God impels are children of God. And at another place, prove whether Christ is in you; if not, you are cast aside, etc. That is testified in order that we may be reminded and shall know wherein (I mean the believers in matters of faith) our committing and omitting consists, viz., in Christ, that nothing else shall impel, lead, and guide the believers than Christ, the word of truth. Our words also shall be so, that we do not speak, read, write, run, gather or assemble unless the Lord himself work it and do it. Without that truly all is in vain and not

the good pleasure of God the Father, may it have whatever appearance it will. Therefore, it does not depend on our willing or running, but rather on the mercy of God and on His grace in and with Christ. He gives the will, He can also do and accomplish it in His own. We must simply in all of our committing and omitting stand idle ourselves, as dead in ourselves, if Christ is to live in us, which life and walk alone are pleasing to the Father. For human wisdom can disguise itself as an angel of light, especially of the scribal kind, indeed also it is often coarse, carnal simplicity that it [human wisdom] deems its simplicity to be a self-chosen spirituality out of which it runs, impels itself, and founds outward sensual sects (which have no spirit), and indeed have neither natural nor divine understanding. These the apostle calls clouds without water (understand the water of the graces of Christ, his Holy Spirit) driven about by the whirlwind, etc. Ah, my brethren, how diligently and carefully we have to take heed that we do not consider our own impulse the impulse of the Holy Spirit, our own course the course and walk of Christ.

I must differentiate it a little and show how it can be tested and recognized, first of all in me, after that also in others, whether our committing and omitting be the impulse of the Holy Spirit or flows from a carnal mind. To make the test: First, it often happens, and I have experienced that in myself, also through many narratives of Biblical writings, that natural piety hates the evil, and is zealous about the good, even after divine nature, which men have in them by nature, that they eagerly further the good, and hinder the evil as they are able; that they are overpowered therein and driven with zeal, exerting themselves considerably. That is not therefore the power and compulsion of the Holy Spirit of Christ. They are driven not by the compulsion of a child, but only by a servile one, and no fatherly compulsion nor childlike progress, as happened to Paul, who persecuted the church of God out of the compulsion of his zeal, and Peter also was driven, who cut off Malchus' ear. Yes, even today this happens under zeal for the sake of Christ, for the good against the evil, as the false apostles in the semblance of Christ were driven out of zeal for themselves; yea, some also out of true faithfulness, who thought one ought to keep the Sabbath, refrain from foods, be circumcised, etc., and other things by which they were driven. Similarly even today, and even unto the end of the world, many men run because of zeal concerning the good, who do not know or suppose otherwise than that they are driven by the Holy Spirit. In part, it is probably true that it is often of God, but not under the office of the true Holy Spirit of Christ, but driven under a servile service. God also uses such servants now, often as a provisional forerunner and preparer of the way for those who are rightly driven of the Holy Spirit of Christ, that they may make the path and the road, clear it, and weed it; they are however only servants and not friends or children, who do not know what their master is doing nor what he has in mind. Such a servile compulsion has taken place in our time, for quite a while now and by contributing to all divisions and sects, in order that the righteous driven by the Holy Spirit of Christ may become manifest.

Luther, Zwingli, M. Hofman, C. Schwenckfeld, S. Franck, and others have been only servants who did not know what their Lord would do.

I write all this in order that each one may well perceive for himself what drives him, from what source it flows, from what source his drive stems. This the servants do not know. The friends and children however know actually what their lord does, and why the compulsion of the Holy Spirit is in them. Paul knew that he must be led to Rome to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Peter was driven by revelation to speak the Gos-

pel to the centurion Cornelius. Also Phillip was driven to the eunuch in the carriage. Paul had no peace until he came again to Jerusalem, to converse again with the leading apostles. Peter was driven to arise and preach to all the nations. Thus the apostles and their followers each according to the measure of his faith were driven. So also they are driven even today through the Holy Spirit as children and not as servants, who with good and true knowledge, know what their Father and Lord has in mind, viz., in such a way that they always know and are certain of the basic reason of their compulsion through the Holy Spirit. This certainty and guarantee consists principallly in four things or reasons.

First is love for God and to grant to my neighbor that which God has granted and given me for His praise and the salvation of my soul. Second is a devaluation and giving up of life unto death to suffer for the sake of Christ and the Gospel and all patience. Third, to realize when God unlocks or opens a door that one may enter the same with the teaching of the Gospel. No one shall open a door which God has not opened, in order that the office of the Holy Spirit remain His own and free. For He it is who opens and no one closes, He closes and no one opens, in order that the pearls not be cast before swine nor the holy things before the dogs, lest they turn about and mangling result. Fourth, that one be free and sound in teaching and judgments and in truth, in order that none speak unless Christ work through His Holy Spirit. By this one can recognize if the listeners are eager, thirsty, and hungry, weak, sick, tired, and fatigued; to them belongs the nourishment, the bread and the drink of the physician and the salve. For the healthy and the despisers need no physician, neither salve, which salve is the word of truth that serves for the health of the nations. These four parts are the true proof that the compulsion is of the Holy Spirit; also that it brings forth fruit at each season. Where Christ through the proclaimed word does not find fruit, there a curse and barrenness soon fall as over the fig tree. All trees are to have fruit, wherever and whenever Christ arrives, be it in season or out of season.

Therefore it behooves us to give diligent heed that we distinguish sharply, diligently, and well our own drives from the drives of the Holy Spirit. I do not write this to weaken, detain, or set aside any one's progress or compulsion, but rather only that it may be well and truly discerned, through the pure fear of God, which fear is the beginning, root, and ground of all wisdom, understanding, and knowledge of God. May the Lord grant us this to His praise and our salvation in eternity. Amen.

Concerning the brethren from Langnau, we thank God who always bears with our weakness and gives us a way of escape in all temptations. Nevertheless it seems to us, as also I said to them here, that they should try to remain there.[7] Perhaps God would grant them a sojourn there for a while, especially the old brother and the very old sister. We do not think that their lord's command would be so strict that they would be expelled [from the canton]. A threat often occurs rather that one should be quiet and not give the authorities occasion to persecute if one meets together unnecessarily. That one should exercise moderation and discretion in such a case, to this end a government often presses for respect for its punishments since they do not like to persecute us. Hence it behooves us to spare her [the government] in order that she may not wrongly seize the believers. This I write also to you beloved brother Abraham, that you will for your sake and the sake of the brethren and sisters use discretion and moderation in order that we do not through lack of moderation lose the place which God has granted us. If the old sister does not want to

7 This is a difficult sentence in the original.

remain, try to have her cared for by one of her friends that she be not with you. It would bring upon you and her a special persecution, hence one should proceed with moderation and wisdom. However, if God's honor and truth is at stake, then we are debtors to give up all and to endure all persecution unto death. So much concerning the brethren.

Among you at Langnau, for the sake of the wife of Lawrence in Lebertal it is my advice, dearly beloved brother Lawrence, that you let her always drink of the valerian herb and drink no other liquid that it might be strong from the herb. One dare not boil it but only place one, three, or four herbs in one batch and then let it stand over three or four days always adding fresh. A dry healing salve can be used for the injury. The quiet brother Lienhart Schuhmacher used it; he had serious wounds but became well. She should have no oatmeal,[8] pork, and no liquid food and drink like strong wine. Bathing is harmful, unless the trouble is in the head. All this, as said, only draws the rheumatism into the head. Food which is not cured [or does not smell?] is beneficial to her. For this time I know no further advice.[9] May the Lord grant us that we may bear all things with patience, since as pertains to the flesh we are oppressed under all infirmities and weakness.

Bartle will himself report to you how we dealt with him out of grace. Every other report he has given to us according to your writing. We thank God for all grace. May the Lord grant us all to continue to the end. Amen. The grace of our Lord Jesus be with you and us all, who desire it from a pure heart, Amen. All of you, each one of you especially by name are heartily greeted with the peace and love in Jesus Christ. Pray God earnestly for us. The same we desire out of grace to do also for you. When you have read the letter among you (if it pleases you in the Holy Spirit) allow it to get to Lebertal and other places. Dated in Augsburg on the twenty-second day of January, 1555.

In the Lord Jesus Christ, the servant and fellow comrade of you all in the tribulation which is in Christ,

Pilgram Marpeckh.

8 The original, "kabaskraut," is not listed in the authorities accessible to me (Schmeller, Götze, Muret-Saunders). "Oatmeal" must be considered a guess. For the rest, this medical section is difficult to translate—nor is it of decisive importance!

9 A similar prescription clearly attributed to Pilgram Marpeck found its way into a medical codex (#11,182) in the Vienna Royal Library. There it is No. 36 and discusses how to make blackthorn juice to cure syncoma. It is dated 1555, and for those interested in pursuing this facet of Marpeck's personality mention should be made of Loserth's article, "Zwei biographische Skizzen . . . " in *Zeitschrift des Ferdinandeums für Tirol . . .* XI (1895) 288. Robert Friedmann also has a transcript of this prescription, which he kindly supplied to the present writer. Did Marpeck derive his interest in medicine from Otto Brunfels in Strasbourg? For Brunfels's interest in gynecology and his publications in the area of medicine and botany, see F. W. E. Roth, "Die Schriften des Otto Brunfels 1519-1536," *Jahrbuch für Geschichte . . . Elsass-Lothringens* XVI (1900) 257-88.

GERMAN TEXT OF THE MARPECK LETTERS

I. Von der innerlichen Kirche.

Dise epistl meldet von der jnnerlichen kirchen, templ, whonung, offennbarung, jnnerlich chor, eusserliche werckh, der ordnung vnd wo vnd wie man anbeten, sundt bekennen soll etc. sampt anderm bericht.

Den Auserwölten, gotesheligen jnn̄ Christo Jesu, vnsern geliebten zu Ausserlitz vnd anderswo zu antwurten etc.

Gnad vnd frid von Got, vnserm himlischen Vaterrn, durch den Herren Jesum Christum, sey vnd ist mit euch vnd vns allen, so Christum von hertzen lieben. Amen.

Hertzliebsten geschwistret jm Herren Jesu Christo. Es send eure gesannten von euch zu uns aus gnaden Gotes komen, wölche wir mit hertzlicherr freud jnn Christo annamen von euch sambt ewr epistl an vns, jnn wölchem wir ewr gemuet, synn vnd geist jnn Christo sambt dem muntlichen bericht eurer gesannten emphanngen, verstannden vnd durchs Herren gnad alles mit hertzlicher freud wol vernomen. Wir preisen vnnd danncken ouch vnserm Got, Vaterr, durch Jesum Christum, vnsern Herren, fur euch vnd vns vmb sein barmhertzigkeit vnd gnad, so er beweist an vns vnd allen menschenkindern. Dann vnserr gmuet hat hertzlich verlangt zuwissen, wie es doch jmm glouben Jesu Christi, derselben erkanntnus vnd bekanntnus, vmb euch
Joh. 17. stuende, weil jm erkanntnus der warheit Christi alein dz ewig leben stet. Wie dann der Herr Jesus Christus, der war Sun Gotes vnd des menschens, spricht, dz ist das ewig leben, das sy dich Vaterr, waren Got, vnd Jesum Christum, den du ge- [302b] sannt hast, erkennen, weil nu jm erkanntnus Gotes Vaters vnd seines Christs dz menschlich heil vnd ewigs lebenn alein stet, ist vnd pleibt jnn ewigkheit. Wz konnen wir dann freudenreichers empfachen vnd von einander erfaren, dann so wir bericht werden, jr von vns vnd wir von euch, dz wir jnn der warheit Christi vnd dem Vatern gleichs syns vnnd eins aneinander erkennen, dz wir wissen, dz Christus Jesus jnn Got Vaterr vnd Got Vaterr jnn Christo Jesu ist vnd pleibt jnn ewigkheit bis zu ewigkheit; ja, dz wir ouch wissen vnd erkennen vnd ouch empfinden, das Christus jn vns vnd wir jnn Christo send vnd pleiben von ewigkheit zu ewigkheit; ja, ouch wissen vnd
Whonung Gotes vnd Christi jn Joh. 14. erkennen, dz die wonung Gotes Vaters vnd seines Christs durch Christum jnn vnsern hertzen gebawen jst vnd jetzt jnn diserr zeit wonung gemacht haben, jnn vnns zuwhonen; ja, dz wir ouch wissen vnd erkennen die frucht vnd werck des Suns, die der Vaterr jm Sun wurckt vnd der Sun jnn vns, dz ist die fellige liebe, dz wir sein wort haltenn. Daran erkennen wir, dz der Vaterr vnd der Sun wonung jn vns gemacht haben vnd jn vns whone.

Dann dise sends, die den Vaterr vnd den Sun lieben vnd die wort halten jn eins. Wölche aber jn nit lieben, die halten ouch seine wort nit. Ja, dz wir ouch erkennen, dz wir lieben vndereinander, wie er vns geliebt hat; so wirt erkennt, dz wir seine rechte junger sein. Dann wer diss gebot

[1.] Joh. 3

hat vnd helts, der ists, der jn liebet; der wirt ouch vom Vater geliebt werden, vnd wirt jn Christus ouch liben vnd jm sich [303a] selbs offennbaren. Diss ist die ware offennbarung Christi Jesu, dz wir empfinden vnd erkennen, dz jnn vns gwurckt werde der willen, werckh vnd wolgefallen des Vaters durch Christum, vnd also whonet Got Vaterr jnn Christo vnd Christus mit Got Vaterr jn vns vnd wir jnn Christo mit Got. Dise steth vnd whonung ist vns erst zubereit worden durch Christum, vnd vor Christi hinganng ist solche steth vnd wonung niembt bereit gwesen, jnn dem dz wir die beywonung jn vns (Got Vaters vnd des Suns) die wort vnd seine gebot (wölche nit schwör, sonder leiicht sein) halten.

Offenbarung Christi etc.

Joh. 14.

Stat der anbetung. Joh. 4.

Also whonen wir ouch jnn Got, jnn Got Vater vnnd jnn Christo, jnn dem Jerusalem, dz daoben ist vnd nit hieunden vff erden. Darjnn jst alein die stat der anpetung, darinn die waren anpeterr anpeten jm geist vnd warheit; jnn gmeinschaft der heiligen, solcher warer vnd dergleichen erkanntnus stet dz ewig leben. Diss heisst Got Vaterr vnd den er gesennt hat (Christum) erkennen warhaftig, wölchs ouch dz ewig leben jst, so wir solliche erkanntnus aus gnaden durch gebet jnn Christo empfachen. So ist vnnserr freud gegeneinanderr jnn Got volkommen, des frewen wir vns an euch, als wir hoffen, des ouch jr euch erfreuet an vns jnn der warheit. Dann dz Jerusalem, des [das] doben ist, dz ist alein durch Jesum Christum jm geist gebawen, also dz der jnnerlich vnd einig templ dz hertz ist. Jnn disem Jerusalem, darjnn ouch jst die stat der anpetung, namlich jm geist [303b] vnd warheit. Dz ist ouch der jnnerlich chor vnd heiligthum (ich main dz hertz der menschen, dz sein die hertzen der wargloubigen), jnn wölchs niembt gon darf dann vnserr hocherpriesterr alein; dem jst der chor vnd das heiligthum alein von Got Vaterr geweicht, der die hertzen, gedannckn vnd nieren zuerforschenn hat. Disen chor vnd heiligthum waist alein er, der hochpriesterr Christus, dann er den Vaterr darjnnen anbetet fur die sundt des menschens. Diserr hocherpriesterr, Christus Jesus, jmm Heiligen Geist sicht vnd erkennth alein, wie der jnnerlich chor vnd dz heiligthum gehiert [hirten, als Hirt hüten] vnd gestalt jst. Dise kirch wirt alein jm geist geschout, darjnn ist alein durch den hochenpriesterr Christum verzeichung vnd vergebung der sundt. Dz ist die jnnerlich kirchen Christi, darjnn dz ewig leben steet, namlichen also, das der mensch jetz fur sich selbs wissen soll vnd muss, wo Christus jn im whone oder nit. Ouch Got durch Christum allein erkennt, wie es jm hertzen des menschens steet, richtig zugot oder nit. Dise jnnerlich kirch wirt erst geoffennbart durch die zukonnft des Herren Jesu Christi, so er die hertzen verclärenn vnd offennbarn wirt mit jm. Wann aber Christus, vnserr leben, offennbar wirt, dann werden wir ouch offenbar werden mit jm jnn der hörrligkheit vor der zeit. Ist sy keiner creatur jm himell, noch auf erden offennbar, ja, ouch den englen nit, durch kein eusserliche wurckung, ja, halt die schon Christus seiner kirchen ge- [304a] boten vnd beuolchen hat, weil die lugner vnd heuchler das ouch noch konnen thun

Dz hertz der tempell.

Innerlich chor, dz hertz der menschen.

Jere. 17.

Innerliche kirch etc.

2. Cor. 13.

Nota.

2. Cor. 11. vnd jnn eusserlichen schein sich verstellen zu einem engell des liechts.

Dieserr jnnerlichen kirchen jm Heiligen Geist send ouch die eusserrlichen werckh (durch mitwurckhung des Heiligen Geists) beuolchen zuthun als ein liecht vor der welt, wie es jnnerlich zeuget zwischen Got vnd den menschen, dz es *Innerlichs ist nit on dz eusserlich.* ouch eusserlich geformiert werde vnd bezeugt jnn der lieb gegen dem nechsten mit leer, mit touff, mit abenntmal vnd mit allerr liebe, zubeweisenn gegen allen menschen nach dem mass der jnnerrlichen wurckhung des Heiligen Geists, zu der pesserung dem eusserlichen menschen jnn Christo; *Nota.* darjnnen ist ouch eusserliche verzeichung der sundt. Also ist der geyst, syn vnd willen des Vaters durch den eusserlichen menschen Jesum Christum leiplich geoffennbart durch wort vnd werckh, gleichförrmig der jnnerlichen wurckhung Got des Vaters. Dann niembt kompt zum Sun, es *Joh. 6.* ziehe jn dann der Vaterr; so kennth niemant den Vaterr *Math. 11.* dann der Sun vnd dem es der Sun offennbart. Also stet noch heut, so lanng heut heist, die fellig erkanntnus des Vaters vnd seines Christs jnn jnnerlichen vnd eusserlichen *Collo. 2.* wurckhungen des Heiligen Geists. Weil ouch der heilige Paulus sagt: jn im whonet die fölle der gotheit leiplich, vnd jr send desselben foll, vnd jr send desselben foll [sic!]; Ephe. 4. ein [304b] gloub, ein touff, ein ler, ain abenntmal, ein Got, Vater vnserr allerr; vber die einig kirch jnnerlich vnd eus- Joh. 5. serrlich jnn ewigkheit. Amen. Dann wz der Sun den Vaterr sicht thun (als Geist vnd Got), dz thut ouch gleich der Sun als eusserlicherr mensch durch auswendige wurckhung. Dann der Vaterr hat den Sun lieb vnd hat jm alles jnn sein hand geben; also ouch wz durch Christum jm Heiligen Joh. 3. Geist von newem geborn jst nach jnnerlicher wurckhung des Heiligen Geists, getouft mit fewer, angezynnt mit liebe. Vnd was solche geistgeborne kinder sehen den Vater durch Christum nach dem jnnwendigen menschen thun, dz thund ouch gleich sy durch dz mitzeugen jm Heiligen Geist am auswendigen menschen. Also wirt der leib Christi jnnerlich durch den Heiligen Geist, ausserrlich durch mitzeugen der werckh gepauth. Dz ist sein kirch oder gmein, wölches ist sein prauth, jnnerlich jm geist vnd warheit, ausserlich durchs wort der ler, gehorsam zulaissten; zusamen verfuegt, Got zepreisen, zu einem liecht vor der welt, aber von der welt abgesonndert zum zeugknuss vber sy, wie dann dz 2. Cor. 6. ewangelium durch wort vnd werckh vor der zukonnft des menschens Suns gebredigt muss werden.

Nit schreib ich das, dz die steth Jsraels durch die gesann- Nota. ten appostl verricht oder all ausgerichtet mögen werden vor dem tag des Herren, [305a] sonnder die werden ausgericht vnd wirt jnen dz heil verkunth, die Got Vaterr zeucht vnd dem Sun gibt. Die wirt er ouch behalten vnd *Joh. 6 vnd 17.* keins verlieren, alein die kinder der verlurst. Ob wol die behaltne kinderr zum dickernmalen [öfters] durch die kinderr der verlurst grossen schaden nemen, ja, gleichs schein zum verderben komen vnd fallenn, so wirt doch dero keins hinweg geworffen. Jch meine die, jnn wölchen die hoffnung durch Got pleibt, dann die hoffnung ist ein

prunn, dadurch man zukonftig gnad, so es Got gefelth, wider empfahen mag. Namlichen die, so durch vnhoffnung jr selb hertzen nit verstocken, so lanng heut heist, die mögen alle widerbracht werden jnn Christum durchs mithelffen seines leibs, der noch heut auf erden jst. Das ist die gmeinschaft der heiligen, darjnn durch Christum Jesum verzeichung der sundt ist. Wann der Heilige Geist straft die bschechen sundt, am ersten alein dem sy ouch alein zugehört zustraffen vor allerr auswendig straff seiner heiligen. Offennbart aber der Heilige Geist die sundt, so straft erst die kirch Christi durchs mitzeugen des Heiligen Geists; das ist aber dz mitzeugen des Heiligen Geists, dz er die sundt offennbart. So mitzeugn ouch die heiligen, das die sundt am leib Christi nit dulth mag verden, vnd vnderscheiden sy vom leib Christi. Wz aber der Heilige Geist jnnerlich jm verborgen straft, durch gnad zu gnad mit trostung der verzeichung, vber solche ist keiner creatur weder jm himel noch vff erden, kein straff be- [305b] uolhen, wie etliche thun aus valscher fursorg vnd die hertzen zurichten vnd offennbaren wellen vor der zeit. Wie der psalmisst spricht: Wol dem, dem die vberdretung vergebenn send, des sundt bedeckt ist, jnn dess geist kein valscheit ist. Wer aber seine sundt vor Got nit bekennt, der doch alle ding erkennt vnd sicht, den straft der Heilige Geist mit offennbarung der sundt. Will er dann weder Got noch dem menschen, so die sundt offenntlich an jm erkennen vnd sehen, nit erkennen noch bekennen durch vermanung vnnd straff, der gehört der welt, wölche der Heilige Geist wirt straffen vmb die sundt des vngloubens. So aber der Heilig Geist straft zu der gnad, so pleibt die emphanngen hoffnung mit rew vber die sundt, so es offt wol lanng ansteet, ee dann die sundt vom Heiligen Geist verzigen wirt mit jnnerlicherr tröstung; wölliche verzeichung vnd tröstung pillich allerr verzeichung vnd tröstung vorgeet jm menschen als ein funckhli der gnaden, dadurch götlichs feur (aus der fölle Christi, gnad vmb gnad zugeben) ferrer anzynnt mag werden mit vermanen vnd furpet der heiligen. So als dann der mensch seine sundt vor Got vnd der gmeinschafft seinerr heiligen jnn Christo bekennt wider sich selbs vnd sich selber rycht, zu der zeit gehört erst dz gebet der heiligen fur solch sunderr. Dann alle sundt muessen mit gebet versuennt werden durchs sterben Christi. Jst aber als dann kein valsch jmm [306a] bekennen der sundt vnd der heiligen gebet rein, so legt darnach erst der Heilige Geist trost jns hertz des sunders vnd verzeicht die sundt. Darnach mögen erst die heiligen durch den Heiligen Geist jnn Christo verzeihen, wölchs alles nur ain verzeichung ist. Dann wer Got betruebt, der hat ouch seine heiligen betruebt, vnd wer die heiligen betruebt, der hat ouch Got betruebt.

Hebr. 3, 4.

Vnderscheid vnd straff der sundt.

Nota.

1. Cor. 5 vnd 11. Dz verborgn nit richten.

1. Cor. 4.

Pss. 32.

1. Cor. 5.

Nota.

Die sundt mit gebet versuenth werden.

Nota.

Das schreib ich euch darum, meine gliebten, das wir mit nichts, weder mit pann noch verzeichung der sundt, noch gebot vnd verpoth, ordnung, noch gebrauch, dem Heiligen Geist furlouffen. Wie dann vil gsetzmacher vnd verpanner jetz sennd, die gwissen zufachen vnd durch die backen zuprennen. Ouch send vil verfuerer, die die vermanung, ge-

Vil gsetzmacherr.

bet, pann, straff, ler, touff, abenntmal vnd die verzeichung der sundt jnn gmeinschaft der heiligen gantz verachtenn vnd aufheben wellen. Darum, meine geliebten, lasst vns jnn nichts vnser gegebne gnad weckhnemen noch rauben, sonnderr lassent vns halten an vnserr vnwanckhende hoffnung jnn Christo, wölches jch euch mit sambt vns vnd allen auserwölten Gotes jnn Christo von hertzen wunsch vnd pit. Amen.

Ordnung aufheben.

Weiters vnd merers zuschreiben (weil euch die brueder von Strassburg vnd bruder Leupolt schreiben, darjnn sy euch mein vnd jr hertz vnd synn offnenn) achte jch vnnot, weil euch ouch die brueder dz vnd anders munt- [306b] lich berichten werden als die lebenndigen brief von vns zu euch. Jch bit Got, so es sein gfallenn vnd zu seiner ehr dienstlich ist oder sein soll, dz er vns die brief, jn vnsern hertzen beschrieben durch den fingerr Gotes, von mund zu mund lesen lass, des ich vngezweifelterr hoffnung bin zubeschechen. Bite Got Vater durch Christum, dz wir all erstaten vnd ersetzen mugen (das leiden Christi, so noch vberig ist an seinem leib), ein jeder nach arth der liebe bis jnn vnd durch den tod als die getrewen mitzeugen der truebsal Christi; dz wir ouch fureinander leiden, wie Christus fur vns gelitenn hat bis jnn das end. Amen.

Colloss. 1.

Es gruessen euch, vnbekannt nach dem ansehen, Jörg Stadler vnd sein eeliche schwester Anna, ouch mein eeliche schwester Anna, mit sampt mir ouch alle, so vns vnd wir jnen nach dem angsicht bekannt send; Got weisst vnnserr allerr namen. Biten Got hertzlich vnd mit ernst (der noturft nach) fur vns; wellen wir als die schuldner ouch thun fur euch vnd alle, so es begeren vnd jnn schuld der lieb verpflicht send. Die gnad vnsers Herren Jesu Christi sey, ist vnd pleib bey vns vnd allen, so Christum von hertzen lieben vnd suchenn. Amen.

Jm Herrn Jesu Christo, eur vnd aller wargloubiger diener vnd mitgnoss am truebsal Christi

P[ilgram] M[arpeckh].

II. Von der Menschheit Christi.

Dise epistl meldt von der menscheit Christi vnd Menschensun etc., ouch vom louff vnd sendung etc. vnd vnderscheid der knecht vnd kinder etc.

Gnad vnd frid von Got, vnserm himlischen Vatern, vnd von dem Herren Jesum Christum, seinem gliebten Sun, sey, jst vnd pleib bey vns vnd allen, so Christum von rainem hertzen lieben vnd suchen. Amen.

Hertzgeliebten jnn Got Vater vnd jnn Christo geliebt. Fur dz erst danckhen wir Got vmb die hanntraichung aller seiner gnaden, die er vns durch Jesum Christum vnd vmb Christus willen, ja, der Herr Jesus Christus selbs, jn vns wurckt, thut vnd verricht, regiert, fuert vnd layt vns durch seinen Heiligen Geist jnn aller warheit seines götlichen willens vnd wolgefallens. Also dz alle die, so Christum Jesum von reinem hertzen lieben vnd suchen, jnn denen allen verbringt er das wolgfallen vnsers himlischen Vaters. Er, der

Herr Jesus Christus, ist alein dz fellig wolgefallen des Vaters. Darum gilt niembt (ja, kein creatur weder jnn himell noch auf erd) nichts vor dem Vatern dann alein der Sun des menschens, der jm geborn jst von der jungkfrowen, vom gschlecht Juda vnd vom somen Dauid. Diser Menschensun (ich sag Menschensun), der ist gesetzt zu einem herren vnd regierer aller ding; ja, die menscheit ist eingenomen jnn Got Vaterr vnd Got Vater jm Sun, der von ewig her ain [158b] wesen, Geist vnd Got ist, ja, der recht weg, die warheit vnd dz leben jnn warer menschheit von natur vnd arth, vom gschlecht der menschen, jn vnd von Maria, der rainen jungkfrowen, ein warer, rainer, vnferrucklicherr [unverrückbar, beständig] mensch geborn. Jn jm alein woneth die fölle der gotheit leiplich. Aus der fölle des Suns Gotes werden erfult alle wargloubigen mit dem Heiligen Geist, also das sie nit dörften etwz reden, wo dz Christus (der Sun Gotes vnd des menschens) nit jnn jnen wurckte, volbracht, selbs thet vnd regierte. Das wirt darum geschriben, dz aller menschen thun vnd lassenn, (wie hoch es jmerr scheint), wie offt halt der Herr von menschen ein Herr genennt vnd gheissenn wirt, ja, halt erkennt ein Sun Gotes sein, wie jn der teufl bekennt vnd erkennt hat, so gfalt es doch dannocht dem Vatern nit, ee der Herr bekenn sich dann selbs durch sein Heiligen Geist jm glouben, durch die leiplich sinn des gloubigen menschens, vnd gleich den Menschensun mag niemant keinen Herren heissen on den Heiligen Geist. Aber ein Sun Gotes mögen jn ouch die vnrainen geister nennen, ja, ouch einen Herren. Aber dem Sun des menschens als einen waren menschen, vom gschlecht der menschenn, der ehren zugunnen fur jrn Herren vnd Got zubekennen, dz vermag kain vnrainer geist. Aintweders sie halten jn (den Herren) fur ein pur menschen, dem sie [159a] der ehren nit gonnen mögen, dz er ouch Herr vnd Got ist etc. Oder aber sie bekennen jn einen puren Gotessun alein ouch nach dem fleisch, damit man dem Menschensun der ehren nit gunnth, dz er vom gschlecht der menschen, fleisch, plut vnd mensch ist.

Nota.

Dz fleisch ist creaturlicher arth, dz ist eingenomen vnd einkomen jnn die gotheit vnd die gotheit vnd die gotheit ist verainigt vnd ain wesen jm fleisch als dz war wort, dz fleisch ist worden, dz dann die warheit vnd dz leben selbs ist. Dem fleisch, gepain vnd gepluet gonn ich allerr ehren, die jm der Vaterr gunnth hat, das ich jn pillich eere, wie dem Vatern. Ja, ich gunn jm ouch alles gericht, dz jm vom Vatern vbergeben ist. Darum dz er des Menschensun ist, wirt er richter sein vnd nit darum, dz er ouch Gotessun, ain wesen jm Vatern ist. Der Geist des Vaters vnd des Suns sein on dz zufor richter. Die vbergab, die geschechen ist, die ist der menscheit Christi beschechen, dz die geeret werd wie der Vaterr als weslicher warer Sun Gotes vnd des menschens. Der, der, der mensch Jesus Christus, (der verbringt alein jnn den gloubigen dz wolgefallen des Vaters), er, der Herr ain warer Menschensun, ist herr, regierer, laiter vnd fuerer seiner heiligen.

Sie wissen ouch durch den Heiligen Geist, dz als jr thun

vnd lassen jn vnd durch Christum geregiert vnd gefuert wirt, also das [159b] sie nit leben (verstee zum wolgfallen des Vaters), sonder Christus jn jnen lept, wurckt vnd thut
Röm. 15. dz wolgfallenn des Vaters. Darum redt der heilige Paulus,
Röm. 8. er dörft nit etwz reden, wo dz Christus nit jn jm wurckte etc., weiter die der Geist Gotes treibt, send goteskinder etc.
2. Cor. 13. An einen andern ort: bruefet, ob Christus jnn euch sey; wo nit, so send jr verworffenn etc. Das wirt darum bezeugt, dz wir erjnnert werden vnd wissen sollen, warjnn (ich main die gloubigen, jnn gloubenssachen) vnnserr thun vnd lassen stee, namlich jnn Christo, dz die gloubigen anderst nicht treyben, fueren noch layten soll dann Christus, dz wort der warheit. Es sollen ouch vnsere wort sein also, dz wir nicht reden, lesen, schreiben, louffen, samlen, noch zusamen treiben sollen, ee der Herr soll es wurcken vnd thun. On dz ist es warlich als vmb sonnst vnd kein wolgefallen Got des Vaters, es hab ein schein, wie es well. Darum ist es nit am wellen noch louffen sonnder an der erbarmung Gotes vnd an seiner gnad jn vnd an Christum gelegenn. Der gibts wellen, der kan es ouch jnn den seinigen thun vnd verpringen. Wir muessen ainmalen jnn allem vnseren thun vnd lassen vnserr selbs muessig steen als die verstorbnen jnn vns selbs, soll oder will anderst Christus jn vns lebenn, wölchs leben vnd wandel dem Vatern alein gefelt. Dann es kan sich die menschlich vernunft verstellenn [160a] jnn ein engel des liechts, sonnderlich die schriftgelerth arth, ja, ouch offt die grob fleischlich ainfalth, dz sie gewonlich mit
Nota. jrer ainfalth ein selb erwelte geistlicheit dicht, daraus sie loufft, sich selb treibt vnd synnlich secten (die keinen geist haben) anrichtenn, ja, ouch weder naturlichen noch götlichen verstand haben. Die nennth der aposstell volckhen on wasser (verstee das wasserr der gnaden Christi, seins Heiligen Geist), vom wintwurbell vmgetrieben etc. Ach
Nota. meine brueder, wie haben wir so wol vnd fleissig aufzesehen, das wir nit vnnsern aignen drib fur den drib des Heiligen Geists achten, vnsern aignen louff fur den louff vn vandl Christi halten etc.

Jch muss es ein klein vnnterscheiden, wie es bey mir zufor, darnach ouch bei einem andern erkennt mög werden, ob vnserr thun vnd lassen der drib vom Heiligen Geist sey oder aus fleischlichem synn herfluess. Auf die brob zustellenn: Erstlich geschicht es oft vnd hab dz an mir selbs erfaren, ouch durch vil historien wiblischer [biblischer] gschrift, das die naturlich frumkheit dz böss hasst vnd vber dz gut eyfert, ja, ouch nach götlicherr art, die die menschen jn jnen von natur haben, das sie das gut gern furdern vnd dz böss verhintern, wo sie mögen. Daraus sie mit eyferr begweltigt vnd getriben werdenn, [160b] sich wirt hinaus lassen. Das ist darum nit die krafft vnd der drib des Heiligen
Nota. Geists Christi, werden ouch darum nit kinder, sonndet nur ein knechtliche treibung vnd kein väterlicher tryb, noch kintlicher louff, wie Paulus geschach, der die gmein Gotes
Acto. 9. veruolget aus dem drib seins eifers, vnd wie Petrus getribenn ward, der dem Malches das or abhew etc. Ja, dz es noch heut geschicht vnnterm eyferr vmb Christus willen, vmb dz

gut wider dz böss, wie die valschen aposstel jm schein Christi getriben wurden aus dem eyferr vmb sich selbs; ja, auch etlich aus rechter trew, do sie mainten, man muest den Sabat halten, speiss meiden, bschneiden lassen etc. vnd anders mer, daraus sie getribenn wurden. Also ouch noch heut, ja, bis jns enndt der welt, dz vil louffen aus eiferr vmb dz gut, die all nit anderst wissenn noch maynen, es treib sie der Heilige Geist. Zum theil ist es wol war, dz es ouch oft aus Got ist, aber nit vnder dem ampt des waren Heiligen Geist Christi, sonnder vnter dem knechtlichen dienst gedribenn. Es praucht ouch Got sollich knecht jetz noch offt zu einem forlouff vnd wegberaitung denen rechtgedribenen vom Heiligen Geist Christi, dz sie die ban vnd weg machen, ausroumen vnd ausietenn muessen; sein aber nur [161a] knecht vnd nit freund noch kinder, die nit wissen, was jr herr thut oder jm synn hat. Solliche knechtliche treibung hat sich zu vnsern zeiten, ietz ein gute zeitlangher, vil vnd vil von allen theilung vnnd spaltung zutragen, auf dz die gerechten, die durch den Heiligen Geist Christi getriben werden, geoffenbart wurden.

Glos. Paulus: Ir habt nit ein knechtlichen, sonnder ein kintlichen geist empfanngen.

Glos.

Luther, Zwingli, M. Hofman, C. Schwenckfeld, S. Frannckh vnnd ander mer sein nur knecht gewesen, die nit gwisst haben, wz jr herr thun werd.

Das alles schreib ich darum, dz ein jeder seins theils wol warnem, wz jn treib, aus wz grund es herfluess, woher sein drib ein vrsach nem. Das wissen die knecht nit, aber die freund vnd kinder wissenn es aigentlich, was jr herr thut, warum der drib des Heiligen Geists jnn jnen ist. Paulus wisst, dz er gen Rom gfuert muest werden, den heiden dz ewangelium zubredigen. Petrus ward durch die offenbarung getribenn, das er dem houptman Cornelli sagen solt dz ewangelium. Jtem der Philipus ward getriben zu dem verschnitnen auf den wagen. Paulus hat kein rw, bis er wider gen Jherusalem kam, sich mit den hochen apposstln zuersprachen. Petrus ward getriben, dz er aufstund vnnter allem volckh zubredigen. Also sein die apposstln vnd jre nachuolger ein jeder nach der mass seines gloub- [161b] ens getriben worden. Also werden sie noch heut durch den Heiligen Geist als kinder vnd nit als knecht getribenn, die mit gutem vnd rechtem wissen wissen, wz jr Vater vnd Herr jm synn hat, namlich also, das sie alweg die grunntlich vrsach jres dribs durch den Heiligen Geist wissen vnd gwiss sein. Dise gewisschafft vnd sicherheit steet furnemlich jnn vier stuckhen oder vrsachen.

Nota.

Gwisschaft jnn 4 stuckhen: 1) Die erst jst die lieb gegen Got, vnd dem nechstenn zugunnen dz, des mir Got gunnth vnd geben hat zw seinem preiss vnd meiner seel heil. 2) Das anderr ist ein verschätzen vnd hingeben leben bis jnn tod, vmb Christus vnd vmb des ewangelions zuleiden vnnder aller gedulth. 3) Zum drittenn, das man warnem, wo Got ein thur aufschleusst oder aufthut, das man daselbs einkör mit der ler des ewangeliums. Vnd niembt kein thur aufthuet, do Got nit aufthon hat, auf dz dem Heiligen Geist sein ampt frey vnd alein pleib. Dann er ist der, der aufthut, vnd niembt zuschleusst, vnd zuschleusst, vnd

niembt aufthut, damit die berle nit fur die sew, noch dz heiligthum nit fur die hundt geworffen werd, das nit volge ein vmwenndung vnd ein zerreissung. 4) Das viert, dz man jnn der leer vnd gerichten gesundt vnd frey jnn der war-
Glos. [162a] heit sey, damit nicht geredt werd, es wurckhe es dann Christus durch sein Heiligen Geist. Daraus man erkennt, so die zuhörer begirig, durstig vnd hungerig, schwach, krannckh, mued vnd math sein, denen gehört die speiss, dz brot vnd des trannckh des artzets vnd der salben. Dann die gsunnden vnd verachter durffen keins artzets, ouch der salben nit, wölche salben das wort der warheit jst, die do dienet zu der gsunntheit der heiden.—Dise vier stuckh sein die recht prob, das der drib vom Heiligen Geist
Mat. 21. ist, pringt ouch zu jeder zeit frucht. Wo Christus durchs gebredigt wort nit frucht finth, do volget bald die maledey-
Luc. 13. ung vnd verschliessung wie vber den feigenboum. Es sollen alle peum frucht haben, wo vnd wenn Christus ankombt, es sey zu der zeit oder vnzeit. Darum geburt vns fleissig acht zuhaben, das wir vnserr aigenn treiben wol, hoch vnd fleissig vnnterscheiden von dem drib des Heiligen Geist. Nit schreib ich das darum, jemannts louff oder dryb zuschwechen, aufzehalten oder abzustellen, sonnderr das es alein recht vnnd vol vnnterscheiden werd durch die raine forcht Gotes, wölche forcht ist der anfanng, wurtzl vnd grund [162b] aller weisheit, verstand vnd erkanntnus Gotes. Das welle vns der Herr vergunnen zu seinem preiss vnd vnserm heyl jnn ewig. Amen.

Dann von wegen der brueder von Lanngenow danckhen wir Got, der allezeit vnserr schwachheit tregt vnd ein auskomen gibt jnn aller versuchung. Doch dunckt vns, wie ich ouch hie mit jnen geredt hab, das sie versuchen sollen von vnd [vns] zugeen, ob jnen Got ein pleibens noch da zuwonen vergunnte, sonnderlich der alt bruder vnd die gar alt schwesterr. Wir achtens nit, dz jrer herren gebot so scharpf sein werd, das mans gar vertreibenn werde. Ein thronuss [Bedrohung] gchicht offt mer, dz man sich still halten soll vnd der oberkheit nit vrsach geb zuuerfolgen, so man mit dem vnnötigenn zamengon. Das man mit dem selben mass vnnd bscheidennheit hielt, dahin dringt offt ein obrigkheit vmb forcht jrer selb straff, dz sie vns nit gern veruolgen. So geburt vns ouch jr zuverschonen, damit sie sich an den gloubigen nit vergreiffenn. Das schreib ich dir ouch, geliebter bruder Abraham, du wellest von dein selbs vnd anderer geschwistret wegen mass vnd bscheidenn-
[163a] heit prauchen, damit wir nit ein platz durch vnmass verlieren, den vns Got vergunnte. Wo die alt schwester nit pleiben möcht, versuch sie bey jrenn freunden einem, dz sie nit bey dir wer, zubesorgen. Es wurd dir vnd jr ein sonndere veruolgung bringen, dz man mit bscheidennheit vnd weisheit fuer. Wann es aber Gotes ehr vnd warheit beruert, so sein wir schuldner, alles zuuerschätzen vnd alle veruolgung zuerdulden bis jnn tod. Souil der brueder halben.

Bei euch zu Lanngenow, des Lorenntzen hausfrow halben jm Lebertal, ist mein rat, hertzgeliebterr bruder Lorenntz, das du sie fur vnd fur ab der baldrion wurtzen trinckhen

liessest vnd kein ander trannckh trunnck, das es wol starckh von der wurtzen wer. Man darfs nit sieden, sonnderr ploss aine, drey oder fier wurtz jnn ein mass gelegt vnd dran steen lassen vber drey oder vier tag, alweg new einlegen. Mag dieweil ein truckhne heilsalben zum schaden prauchen, es hat der schweigennt bruder Lienhart Schuchmacher geprauchet, hat gross schaden gehapt vnnd ist heyl worden. Kein kabaskrauth, schweine fleisch vnd wz flussige speiss vnd tranckh als starckher wein soll jr nichts, vnd dz bad ist gar schedlich, es wer dann [163b] nit jm houpt; das alles wie gemeldt zeucht die fluss nur jns houpt. Speiss, die nit reucht, jst jr nutz. Waiss jetz dissmals kein andern rat. Der Herr geb vns, dz wirs alles mit gedult tragen, weil wir dem fleisch nach aller prechligkheit vnd schwach[heit] vnterworffen sein.

Dann des Partles halben wirt er euch selbs berichten, wie wirs aus gnaden mit jm gehanndlet haben. Allen andern bericht hat er vns lauth eurs schreibens anzeigt. Wir danckhen Got fur alle gnad. Der Herr vergunn vns allenn, dz endt zubeharren. Amen. Die gnad vnsers Herren Jesu sey mit euch vnd vns allen, so es von rainem hertzen begeren. Amen. Seyt alle, ein jedes jnn sonders, mit namen, hertzlich mit dem frid vnd lieb jnn Christi [jnn Christo] gegruest. Biten Got mit ernst fur vns, dz begeren wir aus gnad, fur euch ouch zuthun. So jr den brief gelesenn habt, mögt jr jn (so es euch jm Heiligen Geist gfalth) jns Lebertal vnd andere ort glanngen lassen. Datum jnn Augspurg, auf denn 22. tag jennari, anno etc. 1555 jar.

Jm Herren Jesu Christo eur aller diener vnd mitgnoss am truebsal, dz jnn Christo ist,

Pilgram Marpeckh.

PILGRAM MARPECK IN RECENT RESEARCH

William Klassen*

Despite the plea of a number of scholars[1] Pilgram Marpeck, an outstanding leader of the Anabaptists in South Germany, has never been accorded the place on the roster of Anabaptist leaders which he deserves. In this review article it will be seen that there appears to be a trend in the direction of undoing this neglect, and both the cost of this neglect, as well as the prospect for the future should become apparent.

In the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* Vol. 47 (1956) Heft 2, two articles were published which are of inestimable value for Marpeck research. The first of these deals with the discovery of the *Kunstbuch,* an early Anabaptist codex of 16 unpaginated and 354 paginated leaves, by Heinold Fast and Gerhard Goeters in a Bern library (Burgerbibliothek) in July 1955.[2] It is a glowing testimony to Heinold Fast's scholarship that he could publish this excellent description of the contents of the codex within such a short time after its discovery, and could also supply an authoritative commentary on the contents of the various writings, grouping them in a quite ingenious way. All of the 42 tracts and epistles contained in the codex are described and fitted into the article under the headings, "Martyr Witnesses from the Beginning," "Concerning the Unity of the Church of Christ (Spread of the Marpeck Circle)," "The Building up of the Body of Christ (About the Teaching and Order of the Churches of the Marpeck Circle)," and finally "On the Place of the Marpeck Circle in its Historical Context and the Preservation of the *Kunstbuch.*"

The first group, "Martyr Testimonies" (pp. 217-222), is of such an individual character that it clearly forms a group of its own. The tracts were written in 1527-1533 and are Numbers 6, 9-12, and 23 in the *Kunstbuch.* Three of these have already been published by Lydia Müller,[3] but their presence in the *Kunstbuch* indicates that the Marpeck Brotherhood drew inspiration and assistance from them in later years. The presence of writings in the codex by Hut, Leonard Schiemer, and Hans Schlaffer indicates that the Marpeck Brotherhood had some type of relationship to the compatriots of Marpeck, who died near Rattenberg. Apart from the presence of those writings in the

*William Klassen is an instructor in New Testament at Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Elkhart, Indiana.

1 E.g., John C. Wenger in *Church History* IX (1940) 36.

2 Heinold Fast, "Pilgram Marbeck und das oberdeutsche Täufertum. Ein neuer Handschriftenfund," pp. 212-42.

3 *Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnter* I (Leipzig, 1938) 12-14 (Hut); 44-79 (Schiemer).

Kunstbuch such a relationship can be shown to exist by a comparison of their theological emphases. Three other writings belong in this period, a letter by Hans Has, a tract by Christian Entfelder written in Strasbourg in 1530, and finally an epistle of comfort dated 1533, which is a typical Anabaptist concordance booklet and contains such concepts as "gospel of all creatures" and "Gelassenheit."

The central section of Fast's article (223-234) deals with the desire of Marpeck to unify the Anabaptist movement, and to continue its spread. It is a fine example of good organization in that Fast organizes the letters and tracts according to the way they relate to the building of the brotherhood, beginning with Strasbourg, then treating the places of Marpeck's influence in the Grisons, Württemberg, St. Gall and Appenzell, Moravia, and finally Augsburg. Fast points out that one of the major concerns of Marpeck during the years 1540f. was the unification of the scattered Anabaptists. One of the finest examples of the theological basis for this concern is seen in a letter written by Marpeck in the Grisons on Dec. 21, 1540. This epistle is also an example of the recurring images of the church, the bride of Christ, and the body of Christ, which formed the major basis for his desire for unity. While Fast (p. 223) notes that any division between various Anabaptist groups (such as, e.g., Moravian, Swiss Brethren, South German) must be undertaken with caution because of the constant interchange of ideas among these groups, yet it is obvious that certain differences of emphasis were present—and it is clear even from the preface of the *Vermanung* that its purpose is to unite the Anabaptists around the banner of Christ. The epistles in the *Kunstbuch,* only one of which is prior to the *Vermanung,* show Marpeck's connections in the various regions where Anabaptists lived who were attracted to his rejection of the forced communism of the Hutterites, as well as his rejection of the scrupulosity of the Swiss Brethren. One hears only faint echoes in the *Kunstbuch* of the Marpeck-Schwenckfeld controversies, which appeared as a result of the *Vermanung* and took shape in the *Judicium* by Schwenckfeld, and the Marpeck Brotherhood's reply in the form of the *Verantwortung* I and II. In this central section Fast traces in a masterful way the various outgoing lines, following them with meticulous care but never allowing a wild guess to pass through his pen.

The fourth section (234-238) deals with the theme of the building up of the body of Christ. Here he discusses the tracts and epistles which are directed to congregations for their edification and instruction. Fast correctly points out the importance and individuality of Marpeck's view of the Incarnation and the importance of the pres-

ence of the Athanasian Creed in the *Kunstbuch* (p. 235). The presence of so many commentaries on the Apostles' Creed among the Anabaptists, as well as the presence of this creed in the *Kunstbuch,* should warn us not to minimize the creedal interest of the Anabaptists. They were not heretics, but were attempting to interpret correctly the creeds of the church! Fast also shows that Marpeck's ethics is controlled by the dangerous (and yet glorious) idea of freedom (p. 236), and that his Christology determines his view of the church (p. 237). This view of the church insists (against all types of spiritualism) that the body of Christ takes on a concrete form in history and accepts the ceremonies of the church, not as mechanical rites, nor relegating them to the doubtful "purely symbolic" area (and thus retaining them merely out of a desire to obey Christ's commands literally), but rather as seeing them related experientially to the life of the believer. In this group belongs the church order drawn up by Scharnschlager, and also the confession of Helena von Freyberg.

The final section (238-241) deals with Marpeck's place in the historical development of the Anabaptist brotherhood. Fast accepts the Marpeck Brotherhood as being a separate group not identified with either the Swiss Brethren or the Hutterites and says that its "theological peculiarities consist far less in the area of principles than in their fuller formulation in the life of the church (p. 238)." He attributes this to Marpeck's personality, who kept an eye for the essential matters as a Bible-believing Christian, yet opposed all biblicistic zeal. Fast shows evidence of a keen analysis of Marpeck when he says that Marpeck's individuality is preserved by his openness to other positions and his conscious acceptance and rejection of them (p. 238). This is most apparent, for Fast, in the fact that Marpeck's colleagues were far more indebted to Hut than was Marpeck. He is dependent upon Hut in his view of the cross and suffering. The relation of Marpeck to Denck also needs further clarification, as does also his relation to Jörg Maler, who made some critical notations on the margins of the *Kunstbuch* which may indicate that he was critical of Marpeck at some points. Nevertheless we owe it to Maler that we possess this invaluable codex today. His motto, "Ohn mich ists verloren" (Without me it will be lost), indicates that he felt that he was rendering a service by preserving this codex.

The essay by Fast is an excellent introduction to the *Kunstbuch* and stands as a model of scholarship. The few printing errors[4] do little to mar the excellence of this work. One might question whether

4 On page 241 the date of Maler's transcription of the *Kunstbuch* is given as 1551, while according to p. 214 it should be 1561; and should not the date in footnote 53, p. 225, be May 29?

Gregor Maler von Chur and Jörg Maler (or better: Jörg Propst Rothenfelder, also called Maler) are to be identified as the same person. The reviewer regards it as improbable, but possible, while Fast apparently regards it as probable. The available evidence does not allow any serious difference of opinion on this matter. It also should be noted that the article by Loserth referred to in footnote 77, p. 230, inaccessible to Fast, adds nothing at all to the solution of the problem of the relations between Marpeck and the Moravian churches. In summary, Fast's article on the *Kunstbuch* is one of the most scholarly articles ever written about any Anabaptist discovery. All engaged in Anabaptist research can be extremely grateful for this contribution, second only to the discovery which prompted it. In the light of this report one can only be enthusiastic about the decision of the Täuferaktenkommission to ask Fast to edit the *Kunstbuch* for publication.

Following Fast's article there appears an announcement and description of a discovery made by Frank Wray,[5] namely that the *Vermanung* of 1542 generally ascribed to Pilgram Marpeck, is actually a revision and translation of the *Bekentnisse van beyden Sacramenten* published by Bernt Rothmann in 1533. Wray comments that the author of the *Vermanung* (and Wray apparently missed Schwenckfeld's conviction that there were two: Marpeck and Scharnschlager) admitted using other sources, but never stated how much of it was borrowed, or from where. Wray first outlines the argument of the *Bekentnisse* (which he ascribes to Rothmann although it also bears the signature of the Wassenberg preachers), then notes some of the striking changes made in the work. The additions by far outweigh the deletions, and so Wray notes what to him are the significant changes. There is first of all the rejection of all force and the direct polemic against the Münsterites in the *Vermanung*. Related to this is the view of suffering and tribulation as essential to the Christian. Further there is the polemic against the Hofmannite view of the Incarnation which appeared in Rothmann's later works. Then there is also the digression against community of goods. Other subjects reveal the peculiar interest of the South Germans, e.g., the question of original sin, the relation of the Old and New Testament (by far the longest addition), the prominence of the covenant in the *Vermanung*, and the addition of an alternative form of baptism (the *Bekentnisse*, although not exclusively, prefers immersion).

Wray deserves high praise for this amazing discovery, and we regret only that he did not detail its implications. Nor should we allow ourselves to be disturbed by the fact that the writers of the

5 "The 'Vermanung' of 1542 and Rothmann's 'Bekentnisse,'" *ARG* 47 (1956) 243-51.

Vermanung borrowed so heavily from the *Bekentnisse*. Such a phenomenon was by no means rare in the 16th century, and it is hard to imagine that this caused the Marpeck Brotherhood uneasiness. At least such uneasiness is nowhere reflected in the *Verantwortung*, where the criticism of Schwenckfeld is refuted by continued defense of the *Vermanung*. At this point it might have been helpful if Wray had discussed the type of literature we are here dealing with. Rather than stress the individual authorship of both of these documents, one should stress their corporate authorship—and above all their *nature*—they are confessions. Just as no one has ever been too concerned about proving Sattler's authorship of the Schleitheim Confession (although in the *Kunstbuch* Scharnschlager ascribes it to him), or felt it necessary to prove the authorship of the Apostles' Creed, so here we are dealing with a confessional or creedal statement—which belongs to the brotherhood. This type of revision and translation has happened throughout the history of the church, and has never been cause for concern. In the Reformation period it happened in Hut's *Ein christlicher Unterricht* (Lydia Müller, *Glaubenszeugnisse*, p. 28f.) and Denck's *Wer die Wahrheit wahrlich lieb hat* (1526), writings which are obviously closely related to each other, or else drew from a common source. Althamer translated Denck's work into Latin without giving him credit for it as far as I can tell.[6] Hans Schlaffer made extensive use of at least one of Hut's writings.[6a] To assume that this is on the same level as a 20th century case of plagiarism does violence to the nature of the writings discussed here, as well as the situation as it existed in those days.

Now about some points of comparison. It should be noted that the *Vermanung* is approximately one third longer than the *Bekentnisse*.[7] The longest addition occurs where a digression on the importance of the differentiation of Old and New Testaments shows the peculiar emphasis of the Marpeck Brotherhood (*TB* 226:32-238:40). It is probably not without significance that a deletion of the statement "Abraham is a type of God the Father, in the same way as Isaac

6 Hut's writing is published in Lydia Müller (*op. cit.*, p. 28f.) and Denck's in the recent edition edited by Walter Fellmann, *Hans Denck, Schriften* II (Gütersloh, 1956) 67-74. It is uncertain who is prior, or whether they drew from a common source. Andreas Althamer's *Diallage, Hoc est, conciliatio locorum scripturae, qui prima facie inter se pugnare uidentur* (Nurnberg, 1527) is an expansion and translation of Denck's work without any indication that it is taken from him (cf. *Hans Denck Schriften* I, edited by Georg Baring (Gütersloh, 1955) 32. A microfilm copy of the *Diallage* is in the Goshen College Library.

6a See *ARG* 47 (1956) 256 f.

7 The *Bekentnisse* were published in a modern edition by Heinrich Detmer and Robert Krumbholtz in *Zwei Schriften des Münsterschen Wiedertäufers Bernhard Rothmann* (Dortmund, 1904) 1-85. The *Vermanung* (hereafter abbreviated *TB*) was published in the *Gedenkschrift zum 400jährigen Jubiläum der Mennoniten* (Ludwigshafen, 1925) 185-281. It is unfortunate that Wray did not use the modern edition of the *TB* since the numbering of the lines greatly facilitates precision in comparison.

is a type of Christ" occurs in *TB* 226:30 just before the section on the Old Testament was introduced. At times the changes are merely errors (deletions because of homoiteleuton, e.g., *TB* 195:17 [cf. *Bekentnisse* 8], *TB* 278:20 [*Bekentnisse* 84]). In this connection also there are a few errors of translation such as "ein" for "geyn," or the variant reading "egeyn" (*TB* 191:24, *Bekentnisse* 4) and some intentional errors such as the translation of "teken" by "mitzeüge" (in *TB* 209:6, *Bekentnisse* 24).

Other examples could be given of how the translators of the *Bekentnisse* rework it to fit their theology, sometimes by merely slipping in a negative, where the *Bekentnisse* implies a positive statement (*TB* 226:3). Another interesting addition is the stress on continuing faithful until the end (*TB* 21b:5, *et passim*). It will be obvious to the reader that we are confronted with a very important discovery here that will yield much to the student of the theology of the Marpeck Brotherhood. We are all indebted to Wray for this important discovery. With the announcement of the publication of Rothmann's works, one is tempted to suggest that it would be a tremendous service to students if a critical edition of the *Bekentnisse* and the *Vermanung* could be published together.[8]

Another major treatment of Pilgram Marpeck is that by the Dutch Baptist scholar, Jan J. Kiwiet.[9] Kiwiet devoted his B.D. thesis to Hans Denck,[10] and his doctoral dissertation to Pilgram Marpeck. As one would expect, he shows a thorough acquaintance with the writings of these two prominent South German Anabaptists. Furthermore, he is aware of the major contributions in the field of Anabaptist studies, as is seen by his introduction to the work on Marpeck. The three main parts of his dissertation deal with: the life of Pilgram Marpeck, South German Anabaptism, and finally, the theology of the Marpeck circle. Within these sections the chapters on the life of Marpeck deal first with his life before his Strasbourg residence (Chapter III) and then a chapter on Marpeck as a leader of the Anabaptists (Chapter IV). What are the major points in this dissertation which call for comment?

First of all there is the increased appreciation for Marpeck the man and the theologian. Kiwiet, like Fast, and independent of him, is aware that Marpeck's ability as an independent thinker is beyond

8 Robert Stupperich is editing Rothmann's writings. In his important published lecture, *Das Münsterische Täufertum* (Münster 1958), he reports on the latest research and on some surprising discoveries on the relationship between Rothmann and the Strasbourg Reformers and Anabaptists.

9 *Pilgram Marbeck, Ein Führer der Täuferbewegung im süddeutschen Raum* (Kassel: Oncken Verlag, 1957) 6 DM.

10 Published in the *MQR* as "The Life of Hans Denck," XXXI (1957) 227-59, and "The Theology of Hans Denck," XXXII (1958) 3-27.

question, even though there is evidence of his dependence upon his predecessors, notably Denck (so Kiwiet). Also Kiwiet calls for a reappraisal of past trends in Anabaptist scholarship which have identified the South German Anabaptists with the Swiss Brethren. Over against this, Kiwiet insists that we must see the South Germans as a distinct type, a group which was not as legalistic and biblicistic as were the Swiss, and which had a more open attitude toward such matters as church discipline and open communion. The contribution of the Swiss was the formal concept, "free church," that of the South Germans the concept of voluntary faith and baptism (pp. 40-42).

From the standpoint of Anabaptist history, the important chapters are chapters V to VII. Chapter IV deals with Marpeck as leader of the Anabaptists. Here his work in Strasbourg is characterized, as well as the later years in Augsburg, although the main stress is on the external circumstances of his life rather than his importance for the church. In this section Kiwiet uses a reference in a letter by Ludwig Fest to "Marbeckin" (p. 35, footnote 40), to show where Marpeck was living at that time. There is, of course, no sure reason to assume that this "Marbeckin" is Pilgram's wife; indeed it is more likely that this was Gilg's wife, as Widmoser shows.[10a] In the same chapter Kiwiet makes the statement that Marpeck was in prison in early October 1531, but the source he refers to says nothing about this (p. 29, footnote 15).

The chapter which ploughs the most new ground, perhaps, is chapter V where Kiwiet deals with the origin and essence of South German Anabaptism. It is debatable that Denck and Marpeck can be as facilely identified or equated as Kiwiet does, or for that matter that they can be placed in the same camp. The lines of Denck's influence may best be seen in Kautz, Bünderlin, Hans Umlauf, and Schwenckfeld, rather than in Marpeck, although it is clear that Marpeck is indebted to some extent to Denck. Nor will all agree with Kiwiet that Hut was dependent upon Müntzer "in religiöser Hinsicht" (p. 43).[10b] According to Kiwiet, South German Anabaptism originated independent of the Swiss Brethren movement (contra John Horsch, Ernst Correll, *et al.*) and their differences were not only national, but religious. The South Germans were more tolerant ("weitherzig," p. 69) while the Swiss were characterized by a biblicistic understanding of the Scriptures. Kiwiet could have strengthened his case somewhat if he had been more precise in his definitions. For

10a Edward Widmoser, "Das Täufertum im Tiroler Unterland," Innsbruck Dissertation 1948, p. 46.

10b See Herbert C. Klassen, "Some Aspects of the Teachings of Hans Hut," M.A. Thesis, University of B.C., 1958.

one thing the evidence of Hans Hut, who seven months after Schleitheim refers to an "Ordnung" in Switzerland,[11] as well as the tensions that Jörg Propst Rothenfelder experienced with the Swiss Brethren would have strengthened his case.[12] In the appendix he feels that he is strongly supported in his theory by the discovery of the *Kunstbuch*. The lack of precision in terms weakens his case however. For example where does he place Michael Sattler, a native of South Germany and the editor or drafter of the Schleitheim Confession? He is a "Swiss Brother," according to Kiwiet; hence Michael Sattler, himself a South German, drafted the Schleitheim articles against the foreigners, the South Germans (p. 44)! Kiwiet was not the first to note differences in personality between Denck and Sattler.[13] But no one has yet proved that these differences erupted into any real break, or that the Schleitheim Confession was beyond a doubt written against South Germans.

A similar problem arises when we look at Kiwiet's definition of South German Anabaptists. Here we are told they were more tolerant (*freier*) in their views and that they held love and faith as criteria in matters of faith. We are to accept also the assertion, "Although we have no statement about it, certainly unbaptized believers took part in the Lord's Supper" at Strasbourg (p. 45). Secondly, Sebastian Franck's judgment of the Anabaptists is cited to prove that the majority of the Anabaptists were not like Sattler, but that nearly all of them accepted the oath, government office, etc. If this characterization is true of Marpeck, how then account for the complaint that Bucer made against Marpeck that he was teaching the people that swearing was wrong?[14] Furthermore, the question should at least be raised as to how reliable Franck is as a historian. Can we accept his statements about the Anabaptists without reservation when he himself tells us that he was only slightly acquainted with them?[15]

Perhaps the most obvious case of imprecision which weakens Kiwiet's case is his use of the term "freie Täufer" (p. 46). It may be that Denck can be appropriately termed thus, but if we use the term with the precision with which it was used at that time to refer to

11 Christian Meyer, "Die Anfänge des Wiedertäuferthums in Augsburg," *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg* I (1874) 228. The date of this report was September 16, 1527. The specific matter he discusses is the bearing of arms, in which connection he refers to an "Ordnung" made in Switzerland. Since the Schleitheim Confession does not discuss the subject of bearing arms it is doubtful that Hut is here referring to it.

12 On Rothenfelder, see F. Roth, *Augsburgs Reformationsgeschichte* IV (Munich, 1911) 615.

13 A. Hulshof, *Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden te Straatsburg van 1525 tot 1557* (Amsterdam, 1905) 24, 29.

14 T. Schiess, *Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer* II (Freiburg i. Br., 1910) 793.

15 Sebastian Franck, *Chronica. . .* (1531), fol. 445, 451b.

those who made no issue of baptism,[16] it is highly inappropriate for Marpeck.

Chapter VI deals with the antecedents of the Marpeck circle. Here Kiwiet attempts to show that during the years in Strasbourg the Marpeck "circle" developed as an independent group, the Melchiorites splitting off to one side and to the other side the Bünderlin group, to which Sebastian Franck and Christian Entfelder belonged. While again one might raise certain questions,[17] Kiwiet has called attention to an important fact, namely that Strasbourg (1530) marked a major parting of the ways for South German Anabaptism, and that here some of the unwholesome elements were purged from the movement. Again he could have cited the evidence of the *Vermanung* (1542) where the preface makes a reference to the splits which have plagued Anabaptism for "twelve years," obviously referring to 1530 (*TB* 187:3). While Kiwiet cannot be judged on the basis of sources not yet discovered, his statement that Hofmann took the elements of Hut's teaching while South German Anabaptism took over Denck's, would need to be corrected in the light of the *Kunstbuch*. It is not by chance that none of Denck's writings are in the *Kunstbuch,* while one of Hut's is. Although Hulshof already recognized the importance of the years immediately before and after 1530 for Strasbourg Anabaptism, Kiwiet is the first to really stress this. With the publication of the Strasbourg *Täuferakten,* which has long been overdue, it is to be hoped that a definitive history of the Strasbourg Anabaptists will be written. Whoever writes this history will find considerable help in Kiwiet's chapter VI.

Chapter VII deals with the "Marpeck Circle." In describing the development of the Marpeck Brotherhood Kiwiet deals first with the relations to the Moravian Anabaptists. Apparently Marpeck made at least two visits to Moravia, one which is described in the *Geschicht-Buch*[18] and the other in 1540 when he visited Wolfgang Sailer who later (1547) became a minister of the Hutterites.[19] Kiwiet feels that South German Anabaptists did not win out against the strong Hutterite movement (p. 57), and this is correct, but in all likelihood they remained separate in Moravia longer than Kiwiet suggests. Kiwiet assumes (p. 158) that the correspondence between Marpeck and the

16 See the article "Freitäufer" in *Mennonitisches Lexikon* I, p. 700f.

17 Such as: Where does Kiwiet get the idea that at the end of 1529 Hofmann and Marpeck *together* opposed Schwenckfeld? (p. 48). The sources he cites do not say so, and Kiwiet himself (p. 53) cites Hofmann's complaint that Leopold (Scharnschlager) had opposed him.

18 *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1953), ed. by A. J. F. Zieglschmid, p. 223f. Or is there only one visit?

19 For Sailer's relations to Marpeck see *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum* VII, pp. 161-67. Compare also Bergsten, *op. cit.*, 44 f.

Moravian Anabaptists found in the *Kunstbuch* refers to Hutterites, but proof for this is not furnished.

According to Kiwiet, since Marpeck was not able to accomplish anything with those outside Anabaptism, he turned to those within, and here the publication of the *Vermanung* in 1542 is the first step. He correctly notes that the basic purpose of the book was to strengthen the Anabaptists and to call others to unite with the group. Perhaps he could have added as a purpose the desire to unify the existing movement.

Kiwiet then moves to a discussion of Leopold Scharnschlager's writings, in which he develops one of the strangest theories of the whole book, namely that Scharnschlager is responsible for the theory that Christ could have sinned, a view which was supposedly expressed in a letter dated Sept. 26, 1540, in the Grisons. What it was that moved Kiwiet to ascribe this epistle to Scharnschlager is a baffling mystery, since all four of the references which he gives[20] clearly imply or assert that Pilgram is the author of the letter (p. 59). It may be that Kiwiet is justified in questioning the evidence from Schwenckfeld's pen, but this reader, at least, would have been pleased to find an explanation for this unconvincing theory. Since he relates this theory to his views on Scharnschlager's authorship of part of *Verantwortung II,* an explanation becomes more urgent.

Kiwiet is correct in opposing the assumption sometimes stated that Anabaptism in Augsburg went the way of Pietism by 1550 (p. 64), and shows clearly that, on the contrary, Anabaptists in Augsburg resisted the pietistic efforts of Schwenckfeld. When Marpeck published the *Vermanung* in 1542, Schwenckfeld replied with the *Judicium,* which was delivered to Marpeck about September 1542. Marpeck immediately began a reply with *Verantwortung I* as well as a letter to Schwenckfeld. *Verantwortung I* was completed in a little more than a year.[21] Having completed *Verantwortung I* Marpeck began work on the *Testamenterleutterung,* which was completed in 1550. After the completion of this massive concordance (800 pages) Marpeck took up the work of *Verantwortung II,* but this he never brought to completion, and so it was completed by Leopold Scharn-

20 *CS* VIII, 220, 275, 282, 290.

21 Although on page 74 he states that it was sent at "Christmas 1544." The authority of Fritz Blanke is given for the assumption that the New Year began at Christmas during this time. The authorities disagree on this. Thus the *Catholic Encyclopedia* III, 739, states that the change from December 25 to January 1 for the beginning of the New Year was made in 1544 (New York, 1913). The important matter is whether the year 1544 or 1543 is meant, and there can be little doubt that Marpeck was here following customary usage and writing the year number which was just beginning (compare Schmeller, *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* I, 1209). According to H. Grotefend, "Newenjarsabent" would refer to the night before the festive day, so Silvestri and Neujarsabend would mean the same (*Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung des Deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*[4] [Hannover and Leipzig, 1915] p. 18).

schlager.[22] According to Kiwiet's theory, Marpeck's literary activity resulted in the union of all the major groups of Anabaptists—the Melchiorites, Mennonites, and Hutterites—by the Strasbourg conferences of 1554, 1555, and 1557. The other evidence he cites from the Hutterite *Geschichts-Buch*[23] that Pilgram was active in Moravia in 1550 is not too convincing, and it is better to accept Zieglschmid's interpretation, which makes the word refer simply to "pilgrims."[24]

Again Kiwiet stresses that Marpeck and Scharnschlager had to yield their opinion that Christ might have sinned, and that this is evidence that Scharnschlager wrote the latter part of the *Verantwortung* after the conference at Strasbourg in 1555. However, Kiwiet does not prove that this conference even discussed the subject of whether Christ was able to sin or not, much less that either Scharnschlager or Marpeck ever held this view. Indeed in the first part (*V* 131) it is not admitted that they hold this view while in the second part of the *Verantwortung* (*V II* 542, 543, 547) this position is explicitly rejected.[25] An evaluation of chapter VII would have to conclude that while the outline of the development of the Marpeck circle is well drawn this outline suffers from inaccurate source documentation at times, and from a slight distortion at other times. This distortion appears to be most obvious where the relative size and influence of the Marpeck Brotherhood is discussed, and a lack of precision is seen where the relations of Moravian and South German Anabaptists are discussed.

Chapter VIII deals with the writings of the Marpeck Brotherhood. It is divided into two groups, books, and letters and songs. A number of points of interest could be mentioned here. Mention has already been made of Kiwiet's thesis that Leopold Scharnschlager is responsible for the last part of the *Verantwortung* (pp. 409-578). It is possible that this thesis is correct, but it is difficult to accept it when it is bound up with Kiwiet's method of proving it. It seems likely, however, judging from Scharnschlager's correspondence in the *Kunstbuch* as well as his address to the Strasbourg Council (in the forthcoming Strasbourg *Täuferakten*) that he was more widely read

22 Apart from Kiwiet's impression that there is a difference in style, he cites the evidence of a letter by Valentine Werner (not printed in *Mennonitische Geschichtsblätter* as he states p. 64, footnote 82) in which reference is made to "schreibens" of the book. This could easily be a reference to copying, of course. Only a detailed comparison of style on the basis of Leopold's and Marpeck's letters now available in the *Kunstbuch* can solve this problem of authorship. The best solution is to think in terms of corporate authorship, or *Gemeindetheologie* as Horst Quiring called it.

23 Josef Beck, *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer* (Vienna, 1883) 188.

24 Zieglschmid, *op. cit.*, 328.

25 A similar strange use of source documentation is seen on page 68 (footnote 106), where reference is made to the testimony of Peter Novesianus supposedly in T. W. Röhrich, *Geschichte der Reformation im Elsass* III (1830) 139, but a check there reveals no reference to Swiss Brethren. It appears that Kiwiet may have mistaken a reference from Hulshof (*op. cit.*, 234) at this point. At other points Kiwiet evidences a rather heavy dependence upon Hulshof.

than was Marpeck, hence we can ascribe the list of contradictions between the early Schwenckfeld and the later Schwenckfeld to Leopold. Also it appears that Scharnschlager used the concordance method with some predilection. Could Marpeck perhaps have written the dogmatic sections of the *Verantwortung,* Scharnschlager adding the Scriptural citations, even in *Verantwortung I?* If this could be shown, the suggestion that Leopold may be the author of the *Testamenterleutterung* would also receive support. Also if this is accepted, the theory that both *Verantwortung I* and *II* and also the *Testamenterleutterung* were written before 1547 would receive support. For during that year, Schwenckfeld makes a reference to a large book written by the Anabaptists in which they deal with the faith of the patriarchs, which he has seen.[26] Kiwiet missed this reference, while Bergsten refers it to the *Testamenterleutterung.* The most logical book, and the one that best fits this description is *Verantwortung II,* and the reviewer does not regard it as impossible that all of these books were completed by 1547. The *TE* would not take a lot of creative thinking, and the later section of the *Verantwortung* may have been added to the manuscripts sent out to the churches.

A similar discussion revolves about the date of the completion of *Verantwortung I.* The phrase "newenjarsabent 1544" has been interpreted as meaning Dec. 31, 1544, and also Jan. 1, 1544. The latter would be in harmony with the statement at the end of the *Verantwortung I* where mention is made of the haste with which the volume was prepared. Kiwiet suggests that probably it was written about Christmas (when the New Year began) of 1544, and yet thinks of it as being about a year in writing. That is of little help. No doubt it was completed in a little more than a year, and the accompanying letter was dated (as was the custom) with the number of the following year.[27]

The most valuable section of this book is the study of the theology of the Marpeck group. Rather than discussing Marpeck's theology in terms of the classical categories, Kiwiet begins with an inductive study of Marpeck's theology and allows that study to suggest the concepts around which an analysis of Marpeck's theology must take place. This is a real stroke of creative insight, which should be a model for all scholarship. As an axiom of Marpeck's theology Kiwiet suggests the idea of "order" (*Ordnung*), which he thinks came from Denck. The basic idea of the order of God concretised

26 *CS* XI, 21. Dated May 1, 1547.

27 See above, footnote No. 21. Kiwiet's statement that the editors of the *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum* indicate Froschauer in Zurich as publisher of the *Vermanung,* "without further basis" (p. 72f.) needs to be corrected. In CS VIII, 162 the editors indicate that their basis for stating that Froschauer printed it is Kucynski's *Verzeichniss.*

itself in the idea of the covenant (p. 85). While it is doubtful that Kiwiet has done full justice to the variety of meanings of the term "Ordnung" as used in Anabaptism, he has nevertheless grappled creatively with some basic concepts of Anabaptism. It is in this area that the lasting results of Kiwiet's work will be felt, rather than in the haphazard guesses sometimes made, and the inaccurate source documentation. Even in these later chapters the reader will need to carefully check all source references, a fact which limits the value of this book somewhat.[28]

Finally, Kiwiet adds brief appendices on the discovery of Wray (described above) and of the *Kunstbuch*. Anyone having compared the *Bekentnisse* with the *Vermanung* will take exception to his statement that the latter is a "wörtliche Uebersetzung" of the former. It is anything but that, rather it should be called a drastic revision and translation. Also one may find it difficult to agree with Kiwiet on his suggestions as to how Marpeck and Scharnschlager came upon the *Bekentnisse*. Scharnschlager was the scholar and apparently a wide reader; it may be that he discovered it. It is highly doubtful that it came through David Joris—for Kiwiet really shows no evidence that Joris and Marpeck had any connections.

In conclusion it can be said that we have here a work of major importance for Anabaptist research. Enough has been said to indicate that it has to be used with caution, but there is no doubt that some of the hypotheses suggested deserve extensive discussion, and will no doubt receive it. Greater care with the proofs would have prevented a number of errors that mar the book. We rejoice, however, that Kiwiet has immeasurably furthered the interest in Marpeck —and there is no doubt that his method is basically correct, and that his conclusions on the importance of Marpeck are sound. Only further research can tell whether the stimulating suggestions made in the book will stand the test. Oncken Verlag has done an outstanding piece of work with this modern paperback, which will introduce the reader to Marpeck for a very modest price indeed.

The last major work to be discussed here is the publication of a revised licentiate dissertation at Uppsala, Sweden, by Torsten Bergsten, entitled, "Pilgram Marbeck und seine Auseinandersetzung mit Caspar Schwenckfeld."[29] As the title indicates, the emphasis in the

28 Did Bullinger write a book *Von dem Touff* in 1525 (p. 87, footnote 11)? Other footnotes that need to be checked are on page 88, Nos. 14, 15, and 23, and on page 93, No. 80. The citation on page 95 (note 93) does not indicate that a limiting clause has been omitted, and on page 101, note 167, a reference to Schwenckfeld's position by Marpeck is interpreted as Marpeck's position.

29 Currently appearing in two instalments in the *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift* (Uppsala, Sweden), 1957 and 1958.

work falls upon Marpeck, and the major source for this study is the interchange in the *Vermanung,* the *Judicium,* and the *Verantwortung* and the letters which were exchanged by Schwenckfeld and those belonging to the Marpeck Brotherhood. Bergsten used all three works reviewed above, hence can be regarded as the latest contribution to Pilgram Marpeck research.

The essay is divided into three main parts; the first section introduces the subject with a brief discussion of Anabaptism and Spiritualism. The object of his investigation is to test the validity of the definition of Spiritualism given by Troeltsch by an examination of a concrete historical incident, namely the discussions between Marpeck and Schwenckfeld. This definition includes three things: (1) radical individualism, (2) the exaltation of the inner word above the Scriptures, (3) baptism and the Lord's supper regarded as superfluous. Bergsten shares Westin's concern that it is "precisely the differentiation between the organized Anabaptist congregations and the individualistic Spiritualists which is the most difficult problem, but also the most urgent task."

The second part of this essay deals with the external course of the "Auseinandersetzung" between Schwenckfeld and Marpeck. In this section the author describes briefly their early contacts in Strasbourg (1529-30), then the publication of the *Vermanung* and Schwenckfeld's reply in the form of the *Judicium.* With extreme care he also follows their relationship through the correspondence carried on during August and September of 1542, and the impact of the *Judicium* upon the Marpeck Brotherhood, expressed most clearly in the *Verantwortung.* Bergsten deals here with all the problems of date and authorship of the various works, taking issue with Kiwiet at numerous points, and always showing a sobriety of judgment and a thorough acquaintance with the sources and accuracy of documentation which is really commendable. Although he may overemphasize the cordiality of their mutual relationship during the Strasbourg years[30] and although the question of the dating of some of these books is still open to discussion, one cannot argue with most of the documentation in this very thorough piece of work. Again, while Bergsten apparently is not aware that the reason why scholars in the past have said that the *Vermanung* was directed against Schwenckfeld was because Schwenckfeld himself said so,[31] he is correct in saying that

30 The reviewer would be inclined to see evidence of tension already in Schwenckfeld's *Judicium de Anabaptistis* (*CS* III, 830-834, July 1530?). Is it coincidence that Schwenckfeld complains that the Anabaptists ordain any unlettered man, and that the importance of a call is important to him already in these days? This first *Judicium* reflects also his reaction to Anabaptist eschatology as seen in Hut and others.

31 In a letter to Helene von Freyberg, May 27, 1543, he says: "Sintenmal das buechlin von Pilgram welchs er *wider vns* geschrieben" (*CS* VIII, 618:6). Our italics.

the major purpose of the *Vermanung* was not to take issue with Schwenckfeld, but rather to strengthen and rally the Anabaptist movement around a core of common beliefs. Related to this is the judgment that the differences between Anabaptism and the Schwenckfeld spiritualism did not become apparent until the 1540's (p. 67). Bergsten is right in seeing in this period the most extended "Auseinandersetzung," but one is inclined to see elements of it already in the first *Judicium* Schwenckfeld wrote about the Anabaptists in 1530, and in other Anabaptist writings of that same period.[32] Naturally, the work of Bergsten must be judged on the basis of his purpose, which was to trace the Schwenckfeld-Marpeck discussions, and our critique as it relates to this early period is justified only insofar as it indicates ways in which the neglect of the earlier period tends to distort the picture of the later period.

Valuable as the first section is, where the dates and external outlines of the controversy are masterfully presented, the most valuable part of this essay is the third section, dealing with the theological importance of the discussions. The essential points discussed in this section are original sin, the faith of the patriarchs, sword and government, inner and outer man, word and office, baptism and conception of the sacraments, the Lord's Supper, Christology, church and congregation (*Kirche und Gemeinde*) and finally a brief conclusion. All of these themes are major issues between Marpeck and Schwenckfeld.

It was pointed out by Horst Quiring that Marpeck held a unique view on the issue of original sin, and this view was attacked by Schwenckfeld. The Marpeck view that sin is only considered culpable after the age of accountability is considered by Schwenckfeld a Pelagian error, and Bergsten correctly notes that in this whole discussion Schwenckfeld is greatly dependent upon Luther. While original sin receives extensive treatment in the *Verantwortung* it is apparent that Marpeck is here lured into waters which are too deep for him, and, as Bergsten suggests, this irritated him. The extensive reply indicates moreover that it is a sensitive point. While Marpeck's view of original sin does have a strong rational strain (so strong indeed that one can hardly speak of a motivating force, *ergo* not original sin as the term is generally used), he is nevertheless prevented from developing a Pelagian optimism by his stress on the power and inevitability of sin in the mature man. In the area of interpretation it is debatable whether Bergsten is correct in laying so much stress on Marpeck's view of predestination. The important thing is that Marpeck gen-

32 In the letter to John Bader, Sept. 24, 1531, he says that he has written the more freely about the Anabaptists, since they had written a booklet against him (*CS* IV, 259).

erally proceeds from the actual situation to a theoretical basis. Bergsten is correct in seeing that the importance of the salvation of the patriarchs was not a theoretical discussion for Marpeck, but intimately related to his view of church and state.

Obviously Marpeck clearly differentiates between the role of the state and the church. On this point he is a "free church man." This includes the rejection of force for the Christian, even though the state is permitted to use it. In Schwenckfeld's critique of Marpeck's position, he is most unhappy about denying the Christian the right to be a government official. To this Marpeck replies in effect that the burden of proof that a man can be a 'gelassner" Christian and also a government official lies with Schwenckfeld. The implication (a far-reaching one) is that Marpeck will be happy to state that a Christian can without difficulty participate in government as soon as it is shown that this can be done without doing violence to Christ's way of love. Bergsten's stress is that it is the abuse of power which makes Marpeck suspicious of government. The reference from the *Kunstbuch* (published in this issue of *MQR*) must be seen in the light of developments within Anabaptism from 1530 to 1540, as Bergsten correctly notes. Most important in this respect must have been the Münster debacle, but just as harmful to the Anabaptist cause was the intemperance of men like Melchior Hofmann who had the audacity to request a church building for the Anabaptists in Strasbourg while Marpeck was there. The troubles that the Strasbourg council had with the radicals at that time certainly did not aid the Anabaptist cause, even though men like Bucer distinguished between the radicals and the peaceful Anabaptists. According to Bergsten, in Marpeck's basic understanding the state has both the beastly character seen in the book of Revelation and the servant character stressed by Paul in Romans 13, with emphasis on the latter.

The basic category which Marpeck substitutes for the spiritualist distinction between inner and outer is his view of the inner and the outer man. In this formulation he rejects the cleavage which the Spiritualists drove between inner and outer baptism, etc., and substitutes instead the idea of witness. The outer man witnesses to the experience of the inner, and the two cannot be separated. To do so is to deny the validity of the experience. Over against the stress on the inner and the outer, Marpeck stressed the union of the two, a view which was sharply attacked by Schwenckfeld.

This union of inner and outer is seen also in Marpeck's definition of the Word and offices in the church. Both Schwenckfeld and Marpeck set the forms of revelation, Scripture and the proclaimed

word, side by side. For Marpeck they are identical, while for Schwenckfeld they are only parallel. Marpeck insists that the preacher does not witness to the Word of God when he preaches, but the words which he speaks are the words of God to us. The proclamation and the proclaimer are fulfilling redemptive functions in God's redemptive plan. The Word of God was written by the Holy Spirit through the hands of the evangelists and the apostles, but in and of themselves ink and paper is not the Word of God, but the decisive thing is the meaning of what is written. Accordingly Bergsten says correctly that "Marpeck does not defend an orthodox belief in verbal inspiration, but rather one should characterize his conception as a combination of the real and personal theories of inspiration" (p. 97).[33] Does Marpeck support a mechanical view of the church office of preacher? His reaction to Spiritualism could easily have forced him to such a position, but he resisted this by insisting that God can work apart from His ordinances, and may choose not to work through His ordinances if they are merely mechanical. Bergsten notes that at this point one may detect a spiritualistic tendency in Marpeck, but that Luther also had this spiritualistic tendency.[34] In this as at other points we see Marpeck grappling with the problem of retaining a faithful biblicism, which honors the Word of God but is not enslaved by it.

Marpeck's view of the sacraments shows that he had not been able to fully reconcile the contradictions between the Zwinglian view of their symbolic character and the Lutheran realistic view. This comes, in part, from the *Bekentnisse,* and in part he tries to overcome this duality by his term "mitzeügnis." Bergsten asserts that Marpeck did not get his views directly from Lutheranism, but that the Lutheran strains found in Marpeck may have come mostly via the *Bekentnisse.* He is certainly correct in saying that the uniqueness of Marpeck's view on baptism came through an independent study of the Bible (p. 108, reprint).

Enough has been said about the details of Bergsten's study to indicate that we have here a first-class study of a very relevant issue. While there is a tendency to find inconsistencies (*Doppelheiten*) in Marpeck's thought without at times giving due regard to the context within which they are expressed, the major impression one receives

33 Compare Paul Peachey's statement: "As Friedmann rightly implies, Anabaptist Biblicism in modern times has become widely identified with the Fundamentalist view of Scripture. It is the view of the present writer that few outside influences have so adversely affected modern Mennonites as this confusion" (*The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision,* ed. Guy F. Hershberger, Scottdale, Penna.: Herald Press, 1957, p. 333).

34 Compare the quote from Luther given by Bergsten: "Denn es mag niemand Gott noch Gottes Wort recht verstehen., er habs denn ohn Mittel von dem Heiligen Geist" (p. 100).

from this essay is that it is an objective presentation executed with consummate skill. It provides a reliable foundation for continued research in many areas, even where one may differ on points of interpretation.

A word must be said about Bergsten's conclusions. He states that in the earliest phases of South German Anabaptism there were two currents of thought. One current bore a biblicistic stamp and is represented by men like Balthasar Hubmaier, Jacob Gross, and Michael Sattler. The other has a strongly spiritualistic and apocalyptic orientation, and within this group it is impossible to separate Spiritualism and Anabaptism as two different movements. In men like Denck, Hut and Hofmann these currents meet to some extent. Bergsten finds strong support for Troeltsch's view that a difference between Spiritualism and Anabaptism exists. The similarities between Marpeck and Schwenckfeld, as Bergsten sees them, are that they both proclaimed the Gospel and had a conventicle type of fellowship. He finds their differences sociologically primarily on the practical level and in the organization of a church. The question could well be raised whether it is not precisely because of this difference between them that Marpeck insisted on a church in which the Gospel continues to be preached, while Schwenckfeld's circle of interested friends remained in hiding and carried on its activity in secret through correspondence. In Schwenckfeld's program not only are the sacraments halted, but also the preaching of the church. He cannot conceal his irritation about the fact that while he is in hiding, Marpeck works openly as an engineer in the city of Augsburg.[35]

Bergsten is aware that Marpeck's theology may have some contradictions because of his changing audience. But he also is aware that much of Marpeck's theology is "alttäuferische Gemeindetheologie," and this may account for the apparent contradictions. Within Anabaptism Bergsten places Marpeck closer to the Swiss Brethren than to the Denck group, especially in his view of the nature of the church, church discipline, and baptism. Marpeck parts company with Denck on his view of the Word, Scriptures, and the ceremonies. Bergsten feels that the basis for Marpeck's affinity to the Swiss is his biblicism, and claims that "Marpeck was in the same meaning of the term (in gleicher Bedeutung) a biblicist as were at least the early Swiss Anabaptists" (p. 66). On the basic issue of the use of the term

35 Writing to S. Eisler after September 1551, Schwenckfeld says: "Lenhart writes that Pilgram had to present his book [editorial footnote says, *"Vermanung," sic!*] to the Council. I did not think he was still there. Thus it is when something is profitable to oneself, otherwise the Council would only reluctantly shelter him. Thus it is that error always has room in this world, but there is no place for righteousness and truth until the next world" (*CS* XII, 659).

"Spiritualism," Bergsten prefers to speak of spiritualistic tendencies, and these can be found in Zwingli, Luther, *et al.*

This very able essay has raised a number of important issues which cannot be discussed here in detail, but must at least be mentioned. The historian will be interested, no doubt, in a definition of the term "Swiss Brethren." As we have seen, Kiwiet and Bergsten come out at different places. What is needed here for a thorough comparison is more source material on Swiss Anabaptism for the years 1535-1550 in order to determine whether Swiss Anabaptism was at that time legalistic, or whether this was true of only a part of it, perhaps those at St. Gall and Appenzell. Or does the term perhaps refer even to "Swiss Brethren" in Moravia or parts of South Germany? In the light of the use of the term in the *Kunstbuch,* the name cannot be used as heretofore, to call Marpeck a "Swiss Brother."[35a] Important also is the use of the terms "spiritualism" and "biblicism." If we use the term "Spiritualism" as Westin and Troeltsch do, must we not by definition place Schwenckfeld into this camp? Bergsten insists that Marpeck definitely belongs to the Protestant Reformation, but that there may be some question about Schwenckfeld. If the first requirement for admission to Protestantism is to have *sola fide* at the head of the list of doctrines, as is most often the case Schwenckfeld would be more eligible than Marpeck. If Christology is the touchstone, then Schwenckfeld (and Hofmann and Menno Simons?) will need to be relegated to the position of fringe figures, while Marpeck would still remain a part of the Reformation. But it is questionable that Christology was the issue during the sixteenth century, and doubtful that anyone saw the Christological issue as clearly as did Marpeck. As is often the case the issues of Scripture and Christology develop parallel to each other.

The importance of Marpeck for Anabaptism lies in the fact that he lived to organize a continuing church body, built, as he thought, upon an Anabaptist understanding of the Scriptures.[36] With the increasing recognition that a church group cannot live in the ecstatic and prophetic outbursts in its history, creative and virile as these may have been, will come also the increasing importance and rele-

(Continued on page 248.)

35a E.g., John Horsch, *Mennonites in Europe* (Scottdale, 1950), treats everyone in South Germany except Hans Hut as a "Swiss Brother" (p. 141).

36 In the reviewer's opinion it is unfortunate that Fast, Kiwiet, and Bergsten all refer to the "Marbeck-Kreis." Schwenckfeld and the Augsburg Council refer to Pilgram's "Bruderschaft," and this term should be retained to point up the difference between Marpeck and Schwenckfeld. The latter did not wish to be called a "church," and was critical of Marpeck for trying to build churches. In the *Kunstbuch* the temptation to become a "Kreis" or conventicle is most clearly resisted in Scharnschlager's writings, and also in the letter by Jörg Maler to Ulrich Agemann.

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE COLLEGES, 1956-57

SILAS HERTZLER*

Nineteen Mennonite institutions giving academic and professional work on the college level have responded with attendance statistics for the school year 1956-57. The Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary began its work as a graduate school in Bible in the fall of 1955. Its report is included for the first time this year, though the information covers the second year of the school's existence. Names and addresses of the schools are as follows:

Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary, 4824 E. Butler Ave., Fresno 2, Cal.
Mennonite Biblical Seminary, 4614 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 15, Ill.
Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.
Bethel College, North Newton, Kans.
Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Va.
Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio
Bethel College, 1000 N. McKinley Avenue, Mishawaka, Ind.
Grace Bible Institute, 1515 S. Tenth Street, Omaha 8, Nebr.
Tabor College, 400 S. Jefferson Street, Hillsboro, Kans.
Hesston College, Hesston, Kans.
Canadian Mennonite Bible College, 600 University Boulevard East, Tuxedo, Winnipeg 9, Man.
Mennonite Brethren Bible College, 77 Kelvin Street, Winnipeg 5, Man.
Freeman Junior College, Freeman, S. Dak.
Pacific Bible Institute, 2149 Tuolumne Street, Fresno 21, Calif.
Bethel Deaconess Hospital School of Nursing, 411 South East Second Street, Newton, Kans.
Mennonite Educational Institute, Box 127, North Clearbrook, B.C.
Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Box 73, Gretna, Man.
Mennonite School of Nursing, Bloomington, Ill.
La Junta Mennonite School of Nursing, La Junta, Colo.

The usual five tables summarize the information given by the various colleges. Table I tabulates the enrollment in each of the schools. Institutions are arranged on the basis of total attendance, except for the two Biblical seminaries, which are placed at the beginning, because their work is on the graduate level. The total enrollment of 4,653 is 473 higher than for the previous year. The increase in attendance was 11.07%, as contrasted with an increase of 6.9% for the year 1955-56. Fourteen schools showed an enlarged attendance, ranging from an increase of one at each of two schools, to an increase of 77 at Bethel College, Mishawaka. In proportion to total attendance the greatest increase was at the Canadian Mennonite Bible College, where the added enrollment of 57 was a 75% increase.

Table II arranges attendance information by classes. Graduate school enrollment shows an increase of 4. However, except for the

addition of the Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary the attendance on this level would have been less than in the previous year. The increase of total attendance is reflected in the enrollment for each of the four years. The freshmen year shows the greatest increase over 1955-56, with an added enrollment of 133.

Table III shows an attendance of 3,413 Mennonite students, plus 1,240 who were not Mennonites. Both figures are above those for the previous year, with an increase of 322 in Mennonite students and of 151 in non-Mennonites. The proportion of Mennonites for the year was 73.35%. Table IV shows that 155 more students attended summer session in 1956, as compared with 1955. The increase of 52 at Bethel College, Miskawaka, was an increase of 81.25% over the previous summer.

Table V points out the number receiving degrees and diplomas. There is a slight variation from year to year, but the overall increased enrollment shows also in the number receiving degrees. In strictly graduate degrees, the Master of Arts was granted for the first time in recent years at the Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary. In addition to the Th.B. degree, 18 different bachelor's degrees were granted to 452 graduates, by 10 colleges. The B.A. is, as usual, the degree conferred by more colleges and to the largest number of students.

TABLE I

TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN MENNONITE COLLEGES 1956-57

School	*Graduate Students*	*College*	*Special Students*	*Total Enrollment*	*Men*	*Women*	*Details Not Given*
M.B.B.S.	25	11[6]	..	36	31	5	..
M.B.S.	34	1	..	35	27	8	..
Goshen	51[1]	1037[2]	5[3]	1093	467	626	..
Bethel (Kan.)	..	661	62[5]	723	321	340	62
E.M.C.	13[4]	513	..	526	256	270	..
Bluffton	..	357	53	410	212	198	..
Bethel (Indiana)	..	359	7	366	126	240	..
Grace	..	328	..	328	145	183	..
Tabor	..	277	41	318	144	174	..
Hesston	..	141	..	141	64	77	..
Canadian	1	115	17[5]	133	65	68	..
M.B.B.C.	2	107	..	109	65	44	..
Freeman	..	107	..	107	..	..	107
Pacific	..	75	..	75	32	43	..
Bethel Deaconess	..	65	..	65	..	65	..
M.E.I.	..	26	..	56	37	19	..
M.C.I.	..	52	..	52	..	..	52
Bloomington	..	52	..	52	..	52	..
La Junta	..	28	..	28	..	28	..
Total	126	4342	185	4653	1992	2440	221

[1] 7 Liberal Arts graduate students; 44 Seminary
[2] 27 correspondence students of college grade
[3] 5 correspondence students not college grade
[4] 11 seminary students; 2 post graduate Liberal Arts
[5] Not of college grade
[6] 6 special students; 2 irregular students; 3 auditors. Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary Catalog, 1957-58, p. 30.

TABLE II
ENROLLMENT BY CLASSES, 1956-57

	Graduate Students	*Seniors*	*Juniors*	*Sophomores*	*Freshmen*	*Special*	*Summer*	*Other Departments*	*Total*
M.B.B.S.	25	..	..	..	..	11[1]	..	..	36
M.B.S.	34	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	35
Goshen	51	143	138	144	265	215	105	32[2]	1093
Bethel (Kansas)	..	77	90	111	182	151	50	62	723
E.M.C.	13	47	52	91	181	29	46	67[5]	526
Bluffton	..	42	60	81	110	21	45	51	410
Bethel (Indiana)	..	46	85	41	93	68	26	7	366
Grace	..	43	39	69	102	30	7	38	328
Tabor	..	31	32	65	110	25	14	41	318
Hesston	..	..	3	40	85	13[3]	..	..	141
Canadian	1	12	20	48	..	35[3]	..	17[4]	133
M.B.B.C.	2	..	22	22	53	10	..	..	109
Freeman	..	..	..	25	42	11	29	..	107
Pacific	..	5	10	18	35	7	..	..	75
Bethel Deaconess	..	..	22	21	22	..	..	..	65
M.E.I.	..	..	..	..	56	..	..	..	56
M.C.I.	..	..	..	..	52	..	..	..	52
Bloomington	..	..	15	18	19	..	..	..	52
La Junta	..	..	17	11	..	..	..	..	28
Total	126	446	605	805	1407	627	322[6]	315	4653

[1] Unclassified
[2] Correspondence students; 5 of these not of college grade
[3] Part time students
[4] Not of college grade
[5] 45 part time; 22 correspondence
[6] Summer, not counting duplicates

TABLE III
STUDENTS BY DENOMINATIONS, 1956-57

	Mennonites			*Non-Mennonites*				
School	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*	*Not given*	*Grand Total*
M.B.B.S.	22	4	26	9	1	10	..	36
M.B.S.	25	8	33	2	..	2	..	35
Goshen	362	453	815	105	173	278	..	1093
Bethel (Kansas)	250	244	494	71	96	167	62	723
E.M.C.	238	258	496	18	12	30	..	526
Bluffton	90	81	171	122	117	239	..	410
Grace	75	107	182	70	76	146	..	328
Bethel (Indiana)	86	96	182	40	144	184	..	366
Tabor	125	151	276	19	23	42	..	318
Hesston	62	71	133	2	6	8	..	141
Canadian	64	67	131	1	1	2	..	133
M.B.B.C.	65	43	108	1	..	1	..	109
Freeman	50	57	107	..	..	..	..	107
Pacific	22	34	56	10	9	19	..	75
Bethel Deaconess	..	58	58	..	7	7	..	65
M.E.I.	37	19	56	..	..	..	..	56
M.C.I.	..	..	52[1]	..	..	..	..	52
Bloomington	..	14	14	..	38	38	..	52
La Junta	..	23	23	..	5	5	..	28
Total	1573	1788	3361[2] 3413[3]	470	708	1178	62	4653

[1] Assumed that all are Mennonites. Detailed statistics not given.
[2] Horizontal total
[3] Vertical total

TABLE IV

STUDENTS IN SUMMER SESSION, 1956

School	*Men*	*Women*	*Details not Given*	*Total*
Goshen	78	313	..	391
Bethel (Kansas)	47	101	..	148
Bethel (Indiana)	21	95	..	116
Bluffton	21	60	..	81
E.M.C.	24	45	..	69
Bethel Deaconess	..	64	..	64
Bloomington	..	52	..	52
Freeman	..	..	29	29
La Junta	..	28	..	28
Tabor	8	15	..	23
Grace	..	..	7	7
Total	199	773	36	1008

TABLE V

DIPLOMAS GIVEN AND DEGREES GRANTED 1956

	M.B.S.	M.B.B.S.	Goshen	Bethel (Kan.)	E.M.C.	Bluffton	Tabor	Bethel (Ind.)	Grace	M.B.B.C.	Pacific	Canadian	Hesston	Bethel Deac.	La Junta	Bloomington	Freeman	Total
B.D.	9	3	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18
M.R.E.	1	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
MA.	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Th.B.	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	3	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	9
B.A.	..	..	68	33	13	13	29	7	14	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	177
B.S. in Ed.	..	..	64	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	64
B.S.	..	..	..	47	4	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	55
B.S. in El. Ed.	..	..	..	18	9	5	..	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	42
B.S. Nursing	..	..	22	6	9	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	38
B.R.E.	..	..	3	..	4	..	..	..	1	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18
B.S. Home Ec.	..	..	..	6	3	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10
B. of Chr. Ed.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10	..	..	..	..	..	10
B.A. in Bible	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	8
B.S. Business	..	..	..	3	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
B.S. Ind. Arts	..	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
B.S. in Sec. Ed.	..	..	..	1	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
B.S. in Biology	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
B.S. in Nat. Sc.	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
B.S. in Theol.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
B.A. Sec. Ed.	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
B.A. El. Ed.	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
B. Music Ed.	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Bible–4 year	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Nurs. Diploma	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	21	17	15	..	53
Bible–3 year	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16
A.A.	..	..	15	11	..	..	3	..	..	..	1	..	39	..	..	..	*12	81
Junior College	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Jr. Col. Bible	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Two Year Bible	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
2 yr. normal	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	4
2 yr. Business	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	2
Chr. Ed.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11
Mus. Diploma	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	3	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	6
Miss. Diploma	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Am. Studies	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	3
Sec.—1 year	..	..	13	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16
1 yr. normal	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	6
Total	10	7	195	138	68	28	32	21	48	20	9	12	39	21	17	15	25	705

* Five of these were two year normal majors

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES

Leo Tolstoy and the Mennonite Author Daniel Musser

Recently Samuel S. Wenger, a Mennonite attorney in Lancaster, Pennsylvania discovered a reference to the Mennonite writer Daniel Musser in one of Leo Tolstoy's books, a reference presumably never noticed previously by Mennonite scholars. Tolstoy's classic interpretation of nonresistance as he understood the doctrine from his study of the Sermon on the Mount is given in his book *The Kingdom of God is Within You,* which was published in Russian in 1890. Later it was translated into English and edited by Leo Wiener, Professor of Slavic Languages, at Harvard University. His copyright date is 1932. The present edition of Tolstoy's book in the Wiener translation is by L. C. Page and Company, Boston, 1951.

In his introduction Tolstoy explains that his earlier book *My Religion* (1884) stated that the chief deviation of the Christian Church from the teaching of Christ was in its failure "to acknowledge the commandment of nonresistance to evil, which more obviously than any other shows the distortion of Christ's teaching in the church doctrine." In 1884 he knew what the church fathers had written on nonresistance and he knew also that there were "Mennonites, Herrnhuters, Quakers, who do not admit for a Christian the use of weapons and who do not enter military service, but what has been done by these so-called sects for the solution of the question was quite unknown to me."

The reader reaction to *My Religion* brought him both criticism and commendation, including information on the history of the practice of nonresistance. Much information came to him from the Quakers. In Chapter I he summarizes the views and contribution of William Lloyd Garrison and Adin Ballou, the latter having influenced him deeply. After devoting several pages to the fifteenth century Bohemian Chelcicky and his book *The Drawnet of Faith,* he turns to two books which he declares were passed by "stubbornly in silence" by the church leaders of their day, the first of these being Dymond's book *On War,* published in London in 1824.

The second disregarded book is Daniel Musser's work on nonresistance, written in 1864. Tolstoy remarks, "The ignorance about these two books is particularly remarkable, because, to say nothing of their worth, both books treat not so much of the theory as of the practical application of the theory of life, of relation of Christianity to military service, which is particularly important and interesting now, in connection with the universal liability to do military service."

After a two-page discussion of the contents of Dymond's book, Tolstoy devotes over two pages to Musser's book, giving an appreciative summary of its contents. He quotes the title, *Non-Resistance Asserted; or, Kingdom of Christ and Kingdom of this World Separated.* The title is followed by this footnote from Professor Wiener: "A thorough search through bibliographies, catalogues, and libraries has failed to reveal such a book or such an author, and as Tolstoy speaks above of the book as being writen, it may be that Tolstoy had a manuscript before him." Why Professor Wiener had not discovered this book by 1932 is a mystery. Perhaps the reason was that Tolstoy does not mention that Musser was a Mennonite, although in the pages that follow he does speak of the experiences of the Mennonites in Russia. One would have thought that Professor Wiener would have checked particularly Quaker and Mennonite

bibliographies. H. S. Bender's *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature,* available since 1929, lists seven works by Daniel Musser, including several reprints.

That Tolstoy was familiar with the position on war of the Mennonites in Russia is shown by his references to them on the pages following in his description of Musser's book. Tolstoy after explaining how the government punishes those who refuse to do military service qualifies his statement by writing, "Thus it acts even at present, except in relation to the German Mennonites, who live in the Government of Kherson, for their refusal to do military service is heeded and they are made to serve this time in connection with forestry work."

The 1864 edition of *Non-Resistance Asserted* was published by Elias Barr and Company, Publishers, Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Musser's one-page preface was written at Lampeter, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, on March 1, 1864. The book, in paper covers, has 74 pages, $5\frac{1}{4}$ by $8\frac{7}{8}$ inches in size. Part I, 46 pages, treats "Non-Resistance Asserted," and Part II "No Concord Between Christ and Belial," which last phrase appears as the sub-title on the title page. It is evident that Tolstoy either had or used only Part I, for he quotes as the concluding paragraph of the book the statements which appear at the end of part I in Musser's 1864 volume. Since Tolstoy translated this last paragraph into Russian and Wiener from Russian back into English, it is remarkable that the words are so nearly alike in the Musser and Wiener statements. The exact title of the book as found in the 1864 edition is *Non-Resistance Asserted: or the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdom of this World Separated, and No Concord Between Christ and Belial.* Concerning Part II, Musser writes, "After the completion of the first part, I was induced, by solicitation of my brethren, to undertake the second part of the work. If this had been designed originally, it might, perhaps, have been differently and more advantageously arranged." This raises the interesting question as to whether Part I could have been printed earlier, separately, and if this could have been the book that Tolstoy used. Copies of the (combined) book are in the Goshen College Historical Library, Schwenckfelder Historical Library, Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library, and the Pennsylvania State Library.

Daniel Musser was the chief historian of the Reformed Mennonite Church, which was founded by John Herr in 1812. Among his works is *The Reformed Mennonite Church, Its Rise and Progress, with Its Principles and Doctrines* (1873).

Goshen College MELVIN GINGERICH

Nikolaus Gerbel's Purported History of Anabaptism

The Strasbourg humanist Nikolaus Gerbel (d. 1560) has been said to have written a book on the rise and spread of Anabaptism (*De Anabaptistarum ortu et progressu).* Since no one as yet has seen the book, it was assumed that it either had been lost before it was printed or that it had not been written at all. Christian Neff was the last to write on the subject. His article on Gerbel in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* (translated in the *Mennonite Encyclopedia)* discusses the opinions of other scholars without coming to a definite conclusion. Of course, it would be of great value for Anabaptist historiography to know some definite facts on so early an historian and his work. Perhaps we even could start on a successful search for the lost manuscript. But a close examination of the traditions on Gerbel's history of Anabaptism destroys these hopes for a pos-

sible discovery of new source material. Nikolaus Gerbel's history of Anabaptism never existed.

The man responsible for the false tradition was Melchior Adam, a historian and biographer in Heidelberg at the beginning of the 17th century. In his *Vitae Germanorum iureconsultorum et politicorum* (Heidelberg 1620), p. 33 f., he gave a short biography of Gerbel in which we find the statement: "Scripsit etiam librum 'de Anabaptistarum ortu et progressu', qui citatur ab Hedione in 'Paralipomenis Chronicorum abbatis Urspergensis'." This statement has become the direct or indirect source of all other citations of Gerbel's history. It also reveals, however, its own mistake by quoting the source of its own information: Hedio's *Paralipomena.*

Hedio's *Paralipomena* were published anonymously as an appendix to a new edition of the medieval chronicle of Burchard of Biberach in 1538/40. They continued the narration of events from where the old chronicle had broken off up to the present (1230-1538). The quotation of Gerbel's book *De Anabaptistarum ortu et progressu* referred to by Melchior Adam is not to be found. There are, however, cited another book of Gerbel's and another "History of Anabaptism," a combination of which must have misled Adam to his false statement.

On page 165 of the *Paralipomena* Gerbel is cited as the author of a book on the Peasants' War: "de qua, unde coeperit, per quos creverit, quibus de causis . . . , D. Nicolaus Gerbelius . . . quatuor libros paravit." The book never appeared in print and its manuscript is lost. Immediately following this information Hedio states his plan to write a history of Anabaptism (p. 166), which, according to his own words and in contradiction of the statement of Adam, had not yet been written. I have treated this passage in detail in my dissertation, *Heinrich Bullinger und die Täufer* (Heidelberg, 1957). Hedio's plan was not realized either. Melchior Adam, however, referring to Hedio's *Paralipomena* must have confused the information on Gerbel's book on the Peasants' War with Hedio's plan to write a history of Anabaptism. The result was his statement on a book by Gerbel, *De Anabaptistarum ortu et progressu,* which in reality never existed.

Emden, Germany HEINOLD FAST

Correction

(A Communication to the Editor)

When I published the anonymous Church Discipline of 1527 (*MQR* XXVIII 162-66, "The Oldest Church Discipline of the Anabaptists") in 1955 I assigned its authorship to Hans Schlaffer based on the evidence on hand. I am sorry to report today that this conjecture was incorrect. Not Hans Schlaffer but Leonhard Schiemer was most likely the author of this Discipline. Both Schlaffer and Schiemer were of the school of Hans Hut (as was also Ambrosius Spittelmayer), both worked as missioners in the Inn Valley, and both died as martyrs early in 1528, Schiemer at Rattenberg on January 14 and Schlaffer at Schwaz on February 4, some fifteen miles to the west. It was Schiemer who sent no fewer than five letters from prison to the congregation of Rattenberg (four printed in the *Glaubenszeugnisse,* Vol. I, and a fifth one in the recently discovered *Kunstbuch*), and who signed one of these epistles "Your humble servant and unworthy bishop, elected by God and his congregation" (*Glaubenszeugnisse,* p. 77). Thus it is quite obvious that it must have been Schiemer

and not Schlaffer who felt responsible for and concerned about the well-being and discipline of the Rattenberg Gemeinde. In my article "Rattenberg" for the *Mennonite Encyclopedia* (Vol. IV) this issue will be discussed at some length. It is truly unfortunate that we know so little about a congregation which of all Tirolean Anabaptist congregations had the highest number of martyrs, i.e., seventy-one. We should also be mindful that it was most likely from this congregation that Pilgram Marpeck came, who was removed from his post as mining magistrate and fled Tirol in January 1528.

May I add further that I owe this new understanding to the inspection of probably the oldest codex of the Hutterian Brethren, the "Codex Braitmichel" of 1566, which is still well preserved and kept at one of the Bruderhofs of the "Schmiedeleut." It is even possible that this codex was in a sense the forerunner of the great *Geschicht-Buch,* also drawn up by Caspar Braitmichel in Moravia (Neumühle?) in the 1560's and completed up to the year 1542.

Kalamazoo, Michigan ROBERT FRIEDMANN

Bibliography of Works in the English Language Dealing with the Hutterite Communities

Bach, Marcus, "Experiment in Contentment," *Coronet,* 1946, 135-39

They Found a Faith (Indianapolis, 1946)

The Dream Gate (Indianapolis, 1949), the only novel about Hutterites in America

Clark, Bertha W., "The Hutterian Communities," *Journal of Political Economy* (Chicago) 1924, 357-74, 468-86

Deets, L. E., *The Hutterites: a Study of Social Cohesion* (Gettysburg, Pa., 1939)

Eaton, J. W., and Mayer, A. J., *Man's Capacity to Reproduce* (Glencoe, Ill., 1954)

Eaton, J. W., "Controlled Acculturation: a Survival Technique of the Hutterites," *American Sociological Review,* June 1952

Eaton, J. W., *et al.,* "Hutterite Mental Health Study," *MQR* XXIV (1951) 47-67

Friedmann, Robert, article "Hutterites" in *Mennonite Encyclopedia,* II (1956) 854-65 (with maps and lists)

"Review of Hutterite Research 1880-1950," in *MQR* XXIII (1950) 353-63

"Christian Communism of the Hutterite Brethren," in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 1955, 196-209; the last section of this essay was also published in *Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision,* ed. G. F. Hershberger (Scottdale, 1957) 83-92

"Christian Love in Action: the Hutterites," in *Mennonite Life* I (July 1946) 38-43 (illustrated)

"Economic Aspects of Early Hutterite Life," in *MQR* XXIX (1956) 259-66

Horsch, John, *The Hutterian Brethren* (Goshen, Ind., 1931; comprehensive)

Infield, Henryk F., *Cooperative Communities at Work* (London, 1947)

Cooperative Group Living, an International Symposium on Group Farming and the Sociology of Cooperation (New York, 1950; Hutterites, pp. 183-91)

Sorokin, P., *Forms and Techniques of Altruistic and Spiritual Growth, a Symposium, . . .* (1954). This work has a special section on "Hut-

terites and Mennonites," dealing however exclusively with the Society of Brothers in Paraguay, an article written by Eberhard C. H. Arnold

Exploration in Altruistic Love and Behavior (Boston, 1950), contains a discussion of the Hutterites

Steele, C. A., "Canada's Hutterite Settlements," *Canadian Geographic Journal,* 1941

The Canadian Mental Health Association, Saskatchewan Division, *The Hutterites and Saskatchewan, a Study of Intergroup Relations* (Regina, Sask., January 1953; mimeographed)

"Troubles in Canada," in *New York Times,* September 29, 1957, dealing with the question of land purchase for Bruderhofs. Similar information also in *Christian Century,* 1928, and other journals.

Kalamazoo, Michigan ROBERT FRIEDMANN

Jakob Huter, Leben, Frömmigkeit, Briefe. By Hans Georg Fischer. Mennonite Historical Series, No. 4. Newton: Mennonite Publication Office, 1956. Pp. X, 85, 74, 11. $2.75

A REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

The author of this authoritative book on Jakob Huter (variant: Hutter), his life, his faith, and his writings is no stranger to the readers of the *Mennonite Quarterly Review.* In the January 1954 issue of this magazine a remarkable study by H. G. Fischer was published under the title "Lutheranism and the Vindication of the Anabaptist Way,"[1] in which the author, a Lutheran minister in Vienna, Austria, makes a passionate plea for a better understanding of Anabaptism from the viewpoint of modern Lutheranism. His main argument then was that the doctrine of justification (by faith alone) expresses only one half of the truth if it is not supplemented by the doctrine of the sanctification of the life of the believer. And it is exactly this idea of sanctification of life which was the main concern of Anabaptism. Thus no quarrel should arise between Anabaptism and Lutheranism; their relationship should rather yield to a mutual fructification of their respective concerns. "It seems," he wrote then, "that we Lutherans should first rehabilitate ourselves in the face of the Anabaptist challenge"; and elsewhere he made it even clearer by saying, "We should become aware of the truth that Christ works in a twofold way: as the Christ *for* us He makes justification available to man; as the Christ *in* us He leads man to sanctification."

In the first footnote to the article just cited, Dr. Fischer admits that "to a certain extent the present paper summarizes the chapter 'Jacob Huter's Theology' of the writer's doctoral dissertation: 'Jakob Huter,' 1949." It is therefore with great satisfaction that today we are able to review this dissertation, which the Mennonite Publication Office in Newton brought out as a book in 1956, in the German language, to be sure, as it was originally written. It is certainly a remarkable event: a Lutheran pastor writing the definitive biography of the founder of an Anabaptist group, which through the founder's inspiring leadership has survived for 425 years, more or less true to the original vision. The study of the documents, mainly the eight epistles by Huter still extant, impressed the author so deeply that he devoted a good deal of his seminary years at Vienna to the study of the Anabaptists. With warmth and great objectivity he pieces together all the scraps of evidence to unfold Jakob Huter's life and thought, from the earliest activities in Tirol in the later 1520's to his assumption of the office of Vorsteher or bishop of those Anabaptist brethren who had sought refuge from persecution in Moravia, their "promised land." It was here that he, in 1533, re-established on solid foundations the communal type of brotherhood living, and it was also here that he came into conflict with other Anabaptist leaders such as Ascherham and Plener, claiming for himself the function of a shepherd or bishop out of divine charisma. In retrospect one cannot help but believe in his "call" to this work, which was to bear such rich fruit in times to come. And then the story concludes with the event of his bitter death in Tirol in 1536, a martyrdom of unheard-of cruelty which he suffered with much resignation and self-surrender.

1 Hans Georg Fischer, "Lutheranism and the Vindication of the Anabaptist Way," *MQR* XXVIII (1954) 27-38.

The second section of the book deals with Huter's piety and 'theology' (if such a term is permissible); it is the best part of the volume. It deals with the origin of Huterite thought and the role of the Bible in it, discussing in the main Huter's ideas concerning justification, baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Church. This might perhaps be a good place to call the attention of students of Anabaptist theology to the subtle distinction between *Gerechtmachung* and *Gerechterklärung* (p. 57), basic for all Anabaptism. Fischer discovered it first in Rideman's great *Rechenschaft* of 1540. For Luther, man, although an incorrigible sinner to the end of his life, is yet declared *simul justus ac peccator* by virtue of faith in the redemptive death of Christ. A formulation like this is utterly un-Anabaptist. These brethren, starting with inner rebirth, set their mind on resisting the temptation to sin as far as humanly possible. This means that man is not only "declared" just but actually "made" just; or that, a Christian should seek his justification "out of sin" rather than "in his sin."[2] This is perhaps the deepest difference between Anabaptist and Lutheran thinking, and it can be documented in the writings of Jakob Huter as well as in those of Hans Hut or Pilgram Marpeck. Hans Fischer touches this issue briefly in connection with a discussion of Huter's ideas concerning "original sin." It becomes obvious that Anabaptism viewed as a revolt against Lutheran teachings would have been pointless had the brethren not believed that reborn man has the power and possibility of resisting this inherent (*anklebend*) tendency to sin. There is no fate that would make man a losing fighter against all temptations, in fact this fight is precisely what the doctrine of sanctification tries to express, a tenet badly neglected by much of orthodox Protestantism. The mood of Anabaptism is very well epitomized by the brief statement of one brother whom Huter had won for the new way: "I know very well that I am a sinner, but by the grace of God I shall try to sin no more."[3]

Baptism for Huter as well as for all Anabaptists is understood with Titus 3:5 as "a bath of rebirth"; the church (*Gemeinde*) as a whole then has the duty to watch the brother lest he backslide. It thus becomes a church of discipline and voluntarily accepted order. This church, in Huter's vision, insists on complete sharing (both in production and consumption) as the very core and symbol of brotherly love. One might regret that Dr. Fischer in his desire to discover the deeper motivations for the principle of community of goods gives too much credit to Lydia Müller's ill-conceived interpretation[4] when she calls Huter's promotion of this communal principle "Gesetzeseifer" and "Gewissensangst" (legalism and anxiety), i.e., an attempt to gain perfection by man's own actions —the familiar reproach of works-righteousness.[5]

In the chapter "Huter—A Witness to Evangelical Piety" (or "Fear of God," the older concept of *Frömmigkeit*) we see the very center of Huter's spiritual personality, above all his truly prophetic consciousness of being called by God, and his dedication without restriction to this office. That is what in Anabaptist sources is again and again called "obedience." To live in obedience to divine call and commandment implies also the foreseeing of the inevitable "cross" along the new path now to be trodden. The cross means suffering, the sign of Christ, the Son of Man; a true dis-

2 On this point compare *MQR* XXVI (1952) 210, note 2, where reference is made to both Aulen and Bonhöfer. For the believer Christ's victory over sin should mean delivery from the actual bondage of sin and not only justification in spite of continuing sinning.

3 Fischer, *loc. cit.*, 58.

4 Lydia Müller, *Der Kommunismus der mährischen Wiedertäufer* (Leipzig, 1928) 63 ff.

5 In his 1954 study (see above note 1) Fischer turns his argument very outspokenly against this old accusation.

ciple must not except anything different from what the Lord Himself experienced. Suffering means here the unavoidable clash with a world ignorant of discipleship and its ways, and therefore has to be accepted in obedience and resignation.

But a vision like that would have been almost too hard to bear, were not an eschatological consciousness alive in Huter as in most of the early Anabaptists; namely that these are "the last and most dangerous times," and that the servant who suffers here will be rewarded by a "Heavenly Sabbath" which will not tarry too long. Huter knew very well that man would never attain a state of sinlessness. Hence eternal vigilance is needed "dass wir die Sünde nicht herrschen lassen."[6] And thus he admonishes his "litle children" (a conscious borrowing of John's term) not to become negligent in the service of the Lord lest they yield to sin. "Be diligent in your walk," he writes in one of his missives from Tirol,[7] "that you may shine as a light in the midst of darkness. God has kindled it in you and now may He assist all of you that you will be able to fulfill His will to the very end. . . . Whoever fights as a true soldier[8] will finally win the crown." It is this Gospel pathos which moves the reader of these epistles time and again, and might eventually convert the dispassionate scholar into a partisan.

The last section of the book reproduces all of the eight epistles of Jacob Huter, written between 1533 and 1535, in modernized German (74 pages), thus allowing easy reading for the layman. The material for this section was secured from the Beck collection (of transcripts) in the Moravian Provincial Archives at Brünn (Brno).

Kalamazoo, Michigan ROBERT FRIEDMANN

Histoire de la Tolérance au Siecle de la Réforme. By Joseph Lecler, S.J. No. 31 in the series "Théologie" published by Editions Montaigne (F. Aubier), Paris, 1955. 2 Vols, Pp. 403, 459. Frs. 2,985.

"The study which we present to our readers has not been motivated by the desire to prove a thesis or construct an apology. It is the work of an historian who has no other intention than to describe in all their diversity the reactions of theologians, humanists and statesmen before a grave problem posed by the Reformation: religious pluralism within the State and within Christendom."

The final words of the author's preface are a sufficient and accurate description of his monumental achievement. To survey the entire course of political, ecclesiastical, and literary history in Germany, Poland, Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, and England over a century time-span, sorting and classifying data and events with reference to one major idea, with the utmost care in analysis and documentation, is a task such as only a celibate—and perhaps only a Jesuit—could find time for. Lecler is critical but not partisan, dispassionate but sensitive and sympathetic, a worthy representative of the grand tradition of French Roman Catholic historical scholarship. Accepting tolerance as desirable, he studies first those factors in the medieval mentality which contributed to the intolerance so characteristic of the age, and then the workings of those forces, stemming some from the Reformation and some from elsewhere, which sought a more humane way of dealing with religious differences.

6 Fischer, *loc. cit.*, note 169.
7 Fischer, *ibid.*, 83.
8 German, *ritterlich;* cf. "Concerning a True Soldier of Christ," *MQR* V (1931) 87 ff.; in German, "Von einem wahrhaften Ritter."

The Reformers, beginning with Luther himself, saw very clearly the wrongness of the persecution of heretics, which denies the intimate personal nature of faith and the priesthood of all believers. Most of the major Reformers left writings witnessing to their early convictions on the matter. Yet somehow these men, interested in freedom as long as they themselves were threatened with perscution, came to accept and even to advocate the persecution of dissidents by the State. That Roman Catholic authorities should have been intolerant is, however regrettable, understandable; they had a theology for it, elaborated by the most eminent teachers of their tradition. The problem is different when we must explain how the fathers and teachers of Protestantism could so rapidly and so consistently abandon their original evangelical insight. One can hardly claim that, intending from the first to be tyrannical, the Reformers hypocritically advocated tolerance for reasons of pure opportunism, only while waiting for the tables to be turned. It must rather be that some inadequacy in their theology prevented their making the transition from minority status to success without losing their bearings.

Lecler sees this weakness in the Reformation's doctrine of Scripture. Luther, and in a parallel way Zwingli and Calvin, had such an overwhelming confidence in the clarity and unity of Scripture as the Word of God that it was impossible to conceive of a serious difference of interpretation between sincere and believing exegetes. Consequently, anyone who differed in his interpretation of Scripture from what Luther understood must have been motivated either by ill faith or by unbelief: since if he were sincere and believing he would agree with Luther. Thus what began as an heroic and at the same time childlike confidence in the clarity and authority of Scripture turns out, for want of adequate theological perspective, to be the stubborn and childish confidence of the Reformer in his own exegetical infallibility, and any opponent must be labeled an enemy of God. We may differ with the Catholic view (of which Lecler makes no special point in his book) that the alternative to such a short-circuited confidence in the Bible is a similar one in the Pope; but he has put his finger on a doctrinal inadequacy at the heart of Protestantism.

But the more significant reason for the Reformers' change of pace probably lies elsewhere. These men were unable to conceive of challenging the medieval ideal of "Christendom" as a Church-Society in which, though division of administrative responsibility between hierarchy and prince is possible, citizen and believer are identical. It was this monolithic view of the Church which, smothered for a moment, recurred as soon as the situation became propitious. The belief that it is a positive evil for two forms of worship to exist in one society was reaffirmed by Luther in 1526[1] and by Zwingli at about the same time,[2] and the doors were opened for a degree of Church-State identification such as the Middle Ages had never known.

In labeling the identification of Church and Society in Protestantism as a carry-over from the Middle Ages it has sometimes not been noticed that the Reformers actually pushed this process farther than the medieval period had. Whatever may have been its other failings, Catholicism did maintain certain safeguards against letting the "Constantinian synthesis" reach its logical conclusion. The international character of the Roman Church, its jealous defense of the administrative prerogatives of the bishops and the Curia, and even its much-decried "double morality" did

1 Lecler, I, p. 170.
2 John H. Yoder, "The Turning Point in the Zwinglian Reformation," *MQR* XXXI (1958).

after all serve as fossilized reminders of the "otherness" of Christian faith and the Church. The Reformation swept these all away.

It was the habit of liberal Protestantism two generations ago to credit the Reformation, seen as a struggle for the right to personal freedom in matters of faith, with all the progress toward tolerance which has been made in recent centuries. This bubble of wishful historiography has long since been pricked by Nikolaus Paulus,[3] though not in a very tolerant way, and by Paul Wappler.[4] It remained for Lecler to fill out this proof with details and nuances. As a matter of fact the Roman Catholic governments of France and Poland came sooner to an explicit religious tolerance than did the Protestant powers. The reason for this was not so much an evangelical understanding of the uncoercible character of faith—this was the Aanabaptist thesis—as the fact that Catholicism was more capable than Protestantism of secularizing the State and realizing that to enforce uniformity would cost more than it was worth.

Lecler thus comes to evaluate the most common arguments for tolerance, using the yardstick of their effectiveness in producing a tolerant regime. Many revealed themselves ineffective: the attempts of the humanists to formulate a minimum doctrinal consensus, or to reduce religion to morality; the affirmation of the mystics that all individuals and all religions have the same Spirit; the claim that if error is left free it will refute itself; the argument, often used in the Netherlands, that persecution impoverishes the country by driving the merchants and artisans away. A similar long-term ineffectiveness must be seen in the gracious concessions of certain enlightened despots ("Erastians"), who while being tolerant when it suited their mood maintained their hold on the Church so that a reveral could always be feared.

Lecler finds that the arguments which finally became effective were those which drew upon the best insights of the Catholic Middle Ages. Alongside its inhumane treatment of Christian dissidents, Catholicism had found some reasons for extending a certain qualified tolerance to Jews and Moslems; these reasons could be, and finally were, extended to apply to heretics. Lecler labels them the arguments of the "lesser evil" and of the "greater good." When the strength of dissidence is so great that the Catholic sovereign exercising his legitimate right to suppress unbelief would do his state more harm than good, then the unbelief is a lesser evil and can be tolerated. The more positive argument maintains that mildness is more effective than force in converting unbelievers. In the Middle Ages these insights were applied only to Jews and infidels; yet they provided a starting point for the elaboration of a rationale for the tolerance of Protestants.

Thus whereas the emphases of the Renaissance and the Reformation were ineffective in bringing about tolerance on a durable institutional level, the extension of already formulated Catholic insights finally solved the problem. Lecler as a historian is too objective to underline this apologetic implication of his study, but Lecler as a Roman Catholic was hardly surprised to find the results of his investigation pointing in this direction. If we register a dissent at this point, it is because the Catholic states, France above all, were not led by considerations of Catholic morality, but by purely secular pragmatism, when they decided to tolerate the Protestants. This tolerance was not a matter of extending to Protestants

3 Nikolaus Paulus, *Protestantismus und Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg i.B., 1911).

4 Paul Wappler, *Die Stellung Kursachsens und des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen zur Täuferbewegung* (Münster, 1910).

the exceptional status accorded by medieval moralists to Jews, but rather a military pact dictated by political pressures and later destroyed by other political pressures. French tolerance is a part of Europe's dechristianization, not of France's Catholic moral insights.

The above discussion has omitted one of the Reformation emphases which Lecler considers also to have been inadequate, namely that of the sixteenth-century "sects." His evaluation of these groups is however strikingly different from that of the other emphases listed above. Whereas with regard to mysticism, humanism, and Erastianism Lecler avoids doctrinal evaluation and demonstrates historically and logically that these views were in fact ineffective, drawing to do so from the historical analysis which is the bulk of his study, he takes the opposite approach to the "sects." He admits their logic and their historical effectiveness, but rejects them on doctrinal grounds, (*a*) because they made of the church a mere association of believers, a party, an expression of subjectivism, and (*b*) because by demanding a total separation of Church and State they cut the State off from all religious bonds. This is not the place to demonstrate that these characterisations are only half-truths; suffice it to observe that in treating them as he has Lecler has unconsciously slipped from the position of the historian into that of the Roman Catholic theologian.

It will therefore be no surprise that the least satisfying section of Lecler's historical survey is that dealing with the Anabaptists. Lecler is well abreast of recent research in Anabaptist history, and distinguishes quite competently between Müntzer, the Swiss Brethren, Hubmaier, Münster, Menno, and David Joris, exposing clearly the basic differences which separated them, in ways which matter directly for the problem of tolerance. But then in the face of his awareness of the dictinctness of these groups and men, both genetically and in principle, Lecler concludes by throwing back in the same sack the quantities he had carefully sorted out, and can then observe that the interest of Anabaptism lies in its ambiguity. The reader, who had just read Lecler's descriptions of a number of distinct and in fact mutually incompatible movements, is driven to feel that the ambiguity is the creation of the historian who persists in using one label for several different phenomena. When challenged at this point, Lecler responds (in a personal not to the reviewer) that he simply adopts this ambiguity from the usage of Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, and the other contemporary Protestant polemicists. What is at stake here is not whether only one or the other of the groups should be called "Anabaptist." This insulting epithet, which the people to whom it was applied rejected, applies formally to anyone who baptizes believers; i.e., to the Swiss and Moravian Brethren, the Münsterites, and the Mennonites, as well as marginally to Davidites and Melchiorites. No one can object to the term's being used for these groups. But the question is whether a historian should evaluate such a superficial parallel as the practice of adult baptism as more important than the differences between groups which had practically nothing else in common.[5] Both terms of the "ambiguity" would have been more fairly treated had Lecler distinguished between the revolutionaries and the proponents of the disciples' Church.

Wooster, Ohio JOHN H. YODER

5 If a Free Church historian were to write on "The Ambiguity of Pedobaptism," demonstrating that Catholicism and Calvinism are hard to reconcile even though both baptize infants, Lecler would recognize immediately that the ambiguity was created by the historian through his choice of an inadequate principle of classification.

Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz. Erster Band Zürich. Herausgegeben von Leonhard von Muralt und Dr. Walter Schmid. Zürich: S. Herzel Verlag, 1952.

In the great series of Aanabaptist source publications which is now in process in Germany and Switzerland the volume by von Muralt and Schmid may well take first place, both by its significance (Zürich was the birthplace of Anabaptism) and its quality. Originally assigned to Professor von Muralt by the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte as a volume in its comprehensive series of *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer,* which was begun in 1930 with Bossert's large volume on *Württemberg* and *Markgrafschaft Brandenburg,* it now appears as the first of an independent Swiss series bearing the same name. The prospect of a broad coverage of German-speaking Switzerland in this series in addition to the comprehensive coverage in the German series (including Austria), so that for all major Anabaptist regions a comprehensive publication and Anabaptist sources in the coming years is assured, is indeed satisfying.

The Zürich volume, containing regrettably only the documents up to 1533, is a model of scholarly exactitude, clarity, and thoroughness. In distinction from the German series, the documents are printed in full, not extracted or condensed, which is greatly to be preferred. In conformity with the best modern policy punctuation is modernized and abbreviations resolved, but the original spelling is retained. The editors have been at great pains to date as accurately as possible the documents, many of which were not originally dated, and to support their dating. In both dating and text fullness, the von Muralt-Schmid volume is a substantial and very welcome improvement over Egli's *Actensammlung* of 1879, which covers exactly the same period for Zürich. A comparison of the two volumes will reveal the great progress made since 1879 in archives publications. A useful help in the present volume is the concordance table for checking the documents in the Egli volume. The philological apparatus in the footnotes is distinctly helpful since the 16th-century Zürich Swiss is sometimes rather difficult.

No historical, theological, or sociological elucidations and interpolations are included in the apparatus, in contrast to the policy in the monumental *Zwingli Werke* edition. This is to be regretted since those who have used the Zwingli volumes know how rich and valuable this material can be. The addition of the Grebel letters from the *Vadianische Briefsammlung* is welcome. An extension beyond 1533 I believe would have been thoroughly justified, in spite of the comment of the editor that the sources beyond that date "offer nothing new." It is precisely the period after that time that is most neglected in Anabaptist history and needs study. What happened to the Anabaptist movement is also important in addition to its origin and is "new." It may be that finances and personnel difficulties limit the extent the Swiss publications, and I would agree that it is perhaps more important at this juncture that the next volumes include the material for the remaining Swiss cantons, particularly Bern. But the policy of the VRG to publish all Anabaptist documents up to the Thirty Years' War, or at least to 1600, is the right one.

Our congratulations to the editors for this outstanding work, to the publisher for a beautiful and well-nigh perfect job of printing and binding, and to the Gemeinde Zollikon for its generous underwriting of the cost of publication. To Professor von Muralt's final word in the Introduction "may this volume be nothing less than a document of historical justice." This is more than justice in the act of the Council of Zollikon,

a Reformed parish town, the seat of the first Anabaptist congregation in 1525, in dedicating a substantial sum out of its civic tax funds to make the appearance of this volume possible.

Goshen College Biblical Seminary HAROLD S. BENDER

The Amish People. By Elmer Lewis Smith. Photographs by Melvin J. Horst. New York: Exposition Press, 1958. Pp. 258. $4.00.

In contrast to the large number of popular articles that have appeared in slick cover magazines about the Amish in recent years, this book represents a serious study of Amish life and culture by a professional sociologist. As in the case of most studies of the Amish, the location of this study is in Lancaster County, Pa., among the Old Order or House Amish. The book is divided into five parts, dealing with The Church, The Family, The Farm, The Amish Fellowship, and The Amish Future.

The first two sections, dealing with the church and the family, cover a considerable amount of familiar ground; but it must be said that Dr. Smith has added significantly to an understanding of the concepts of church and family in that he has brought the insights of the social scientists to bear on them. He points out, for instance, that the Amish hurch represents in a sense the invisible church since it does not represent a particular place or a special structure. It is, to be sure, a fellowship of the spirit.

An interesting illustration in connection with the choosing of church leaders is cited. The author points out how a young Amishman studied the Bible consistently and looked forward to the time when he might be chosen to become one of the ministers. He enjoyed studying the Bible and derived much pleasure from memorizing Scripture passages. At 40 years of age he still had not been chosen. This illustrates that a man who is interested in becoming a leader and who might be qualified may not be chosen, while others who have no interest and who hope not to be chosen may be selected by lot to fill the function of religious leader.

The chapter on the young married couple contains valuable information which this reviewer has not found elsewhere. The author points out the birth rate of the Amish as compared with the U.S. birth rate, fertility rate, and fecundity rates, and gives a comparison of family sizes and the age of parents at birth of the first child. This chapter also contains interesting data relative to family names which suggests the degree of endogamy practiced among the Amish. Out of 508 consecutive Amish births, the name of Stoltzfus appeared 28 percent of the time. An examination of 582 Amish male given names showed that eight names represented more than half of all the Amish given names; they are John, Amos, David, Jacob, Samuel, Daniel, Levi, and Christian. Among the given names for women, seven constituted about half of all names given to girls: they are Mary, Annie, Katy, Sara, Fanny, Barbara, and Rebecca.

In his description of the Amish home, the author shares interesting insights about the human side of family life as well as describing vividly the material side of the home. One such illustration is the statement made that meals are always served in the kitchen, which also has a couch where the father rests after the noon meal and sometimes in the early evening, thus placing himself in the midst of family activities. Dr. Smith's treatment is thoroughly sympathetic and at the same time thoroughly objective and scholarly. Not the least interesting aspect of the book is his discernment of humorous aspects in Amish life, but at no place does he make fun of Amish beliefs and practices.

The chapters on the Amish community and the isolation from world ideas give the reader a good insight into the constant dilemma which the Amish face between the members and the non-members of the Amish community. His description of the way the non-Amish feel toward their Amish neighbors is of value. The chapter dealing with education is helpful in understanding why the Amish are opposed to higher education and to the centralized school systems. He points out that they see very readily that in educational philosophy ideals are worth more than are techniques of earning a living.

In the final chapter, dealing with the Amish future, the author gives a very realistic analysis of the external influences playing on Amish culture and the internal resources that tend to resist change in making the adjustment to the new day. Although the author does not pretend to give a final answer to the question of the future of the Amish, he leans toward the view that they have the necessary resources to maintain their own in a rapidly increasing industrial society. Time alone will tell. The value of the book is considerably enhanced by fourteen full pages of excellent photographic shots, illustrating typical scenes in Amish everyday life.

Bethel College J. WINFIELD FRETZ

In den Steppen Sibiriens. By Gerhard Fast and others. Rosthern: John Heese, 1957. Pp. 146. Illustrated. $2.00

Gerhard Fast as editor-author and John Heese as publisher have undertaken the significant task of presenting the story of the Mennonites in Siberia. It is based on materials written and collected by such eyewitnesses as Kornelius D. Harder and Peter J. Wiebe. Friends of the Siberian Mennonite settlements contributed to this project financially and reviewed the manuscript.

This book deals primarily with the Barnaul or Slavgorod settlement. It tells how the land in the Kulunda Steppe was made available, how the settlement originated, where the people came from, what the early problems were, and how the settlement developed, including the economic, cultural, health, social, and religious aspects. Many illustrations and a map of the Slavgorod settlement enhance the value of the book. The story of the settlements is told up to the time when communication with the outside world became impossible. It could be said that recent contacts should have enabled the author-editor to add more information about what has happened since 1930 and particularly during the last years when some religious freedom has again been granted in Russia. Only a brief reference to this is found.

In the sixth chapter, pages 135-56, the author deals with the other Mennonite settlements of Siberia—Omsk, Pavlodar, and Amur. Their consideration was not in the original plan and the presentation is, therefore, rather sketchy. The material in its final form still leaves the impression that it has not been fully integrated. The numerous contributions and the writings of the editor-author can be traced, and repetitions and gaps are not fully eliminated. Particularly the section on Omsk lacks clarity. More statistics could have been used. In spit of these few shortcomings, the book can be highly recommended for use in all our libraries and homes and will remain a memorial to the economic and cultural achievements of the Mennonites of Siberia. The old Siberian Mennonite settlements may very well, if there is a future for the Mennonites in

Soviet Russia, become the cultural and religious nucleus for the many thousands of Mennonites who were sent to Siberia under the rule of Stalin.

Bethel College CORNELIUS KRAHN

Pilgram Marpeck in Recent Research

(Continued from page 229.)

vance of Marpeck. Moreover, as Kiwiet has clearly shown, Marpeck's relevance extends also into the realm of the discussions being carried on about the unity of the church far beyond that of any other 16th century Reformer.

Perhaps the importance of Marpeck can best be stated in Bergsten's words: "Despite his dependence upon numerous contemporary theological authorities and currents, and despite the inner contradictions in his dogmatic formulations, it is apparent that Marpeck was an important Anabaptist theologian, who made independent and profound contributions to the theology of the Reformation" (p. 134, reprint).